ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY
A15041688476

A15041 688476

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/bwb_S0-BQD-970

W. J. Bryan Jr. Count Tolstoy Mr. Bryan

UNDER OTHER FLAGS

Travels,
Lectures,
Speeches.

G
463
.B93
West

WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN

1904
THE WOODRUFF-COLLINS PRINTING CO.,
LINCOLN, NEBRASKA.

Arizona State Univ. West Campus Library

5936

TABLE OF CONTENTS

On the High Seas 9

European Letters 11

- Tariff Debate in England 13
- Ireland and Her Leaders 22
- Growth of Municipal Ownership 29
- France and Her People 38
- The Republic of Switzerland 51
- Three Little Kingdoms 58
  - Denmark 58
  - Belgium 61
  - The Netherlands 64
- Germany and Socialism 67
- Russia and Her Czar 77
- Rome—the Catholic Capital 86
- Tolstoy, the Apostle of Love 96
- Notes on Europe 109

Thanksgiving Address, London, England 125

The Pearl of the Antilles 137

Birth of the Cuban Republic 156

Patriotism, Havana, Cuba 171

Mexico, First Visit 179

Mexico, Second Visit 194

Value of an Ideal 213

A Conquering Nation 245

The Attractions of Farming 277

Peace, Holland Society Dinner 291

Imperialism, Acceptance Speech 1900 305

"I Have Kept the Faith," St. Louis Speech.....341
Naboth's Vineyard, Denver, Colo.....357
British Rule in India.....363
Philo Sherman Bennett, at His Grave.....379
Wonders of the West.....383

ILLUSTRATIONS

Frontispiece.
Pope, Tolstoy and Nicholas..... 86

INTRODUCTION.

The articles, lectures and speeches contained in this volume are published in this form for two reasons: First, because I desire to preserve them for reference; and second, because the inquiries received in regard to them indicate that others may desire them in book form. The lectures are published for the first time. The articles on my travels, except Notes on Europe, have been published before, and due acknowledgement is made.



On the High Sea

Introductory to the European Letters Written by Mr. Bryan

On The High Sea.

On Board "The Majestic," Tuesday Evening, Nov. 17.—"Rocked in the cradle of the deep"—I recalled these words when the royal mail ship, "The Majestic," dropped her pilot at Sandy Hook and turned her prow toward Liverpool, but I could not either the first night or the second truthfully repeat the next line—"I lay me down in peace to sleep." But the ocean was so smooth and the weather so favorable that the evidences of sea-sickness soon disappeared and the trip has been a most enjoyable one. The steamer flies the English flag and belongs to the White Star line. She is 585 feet long, 58 1-2 feet beam and has a capacity of 1,433 souls (including crew of 316). The passenger rates run from $30 steerage to $350 for best rooms in first cabin. There are only 498 passengers aboard this trip, divided as follows: 62 first class, 75 second class, 361 third class. The boat also carries a large amount of freight.

We left New York at noon Wednesday, November 11, and will reach Queenstown soon after midnight tonight (Tuesday, 17th). The west-bound trip is apparently made in about ten hours less time because five hours are added to the time in traveling toward the United States, while five hours are subtracted from the time going east.

Captain Edward J. Smith, commander of the ship, showed a party of us through the vessel and we

could not but praise the cleanliness and convenience of all apartments and appreciate the efforts put forth for the security of those on board. We were awed by the massiveness of the propelling machinery, and then we went into the furnace rooms and caught a glimpse of the stokers who, down in the dockhold beneath the water's level, shovel in the nearly four hundred tons of coal required for a day's run. These men work four hours out of each twelve and receive about six dollars per week and board—the rates established by the English labor organization. One of the employes in the cabin said that the stokers on passenger steamers like "The Majestic" had much more pleasant work than men similarly employed on gun boats, but it is hard to imagine any labor less inviting than that of the begrimed and perspiring men who kept the fires aglow while the passengers above compared experiences and discussed questions individual, national and international.

An ocean voyage furnishes an excellent opportunity for extending one's acquaintance. At the table Mr. Charles Michaelson, of the New York Journal, was my neighbor on the left and next to him sat Mr. E. D. Vaille, formerly American consul at Zanzibar, now on his way back to that country to purchase ivory for a New York firm. To my right sat Mr. Barrett, a London music writer of distinction. He was returning from his first visit to the states. Mr. Balcombe of London and Mr. Warren of Louisville, Ky., both extensive travelers, occupied seats at the further end of the table. My son's seat was not often occupied, ow-

ing to a disinclination on his part to risk the effect of the boat's motion on his appetite. At an adjoining table sat three of the most interesting men whom I have thus far met on the trip—Mr. Edgar Wallace of the London Mail, Mr. A. W. Black, until recently mayor of Nottingham, and Mr. A. J. Shepheard, a member of the county council of London. Among the passengers are the Earl of Denbigh and wife, Hon. J. A. Pease, a liberal member of parliament, Mr. S. B. Boulton and family of London, Father O'Grady of the Argentine Republic, Mr. Wetmore, a Chicago grain merchant, and son, and a number of others, each possessed of information in his particular line of work.

Mr. Michaelson and Mr. Wallace are companions in journalism. Mr. Barrett entertained us with music, while Mr. Black and Mr. Shepheard have given me many valuable suggestions in the line of municipal ownership—suggestions gathered from their connection with the governments of their respective cities. Lord Denbigh is colonel of the Honorable Artillery regiment which was recently so handsomely entertained by Boston and other eastern cities. His banquet speech at the Massachusetts capital showed him to be a happy after-dinner orator, his reference to the tea incident being especially felicitious. He said that the English and the Americans once had a little difference about tea in Boston harbor. The former, he declared, wanted the tea "in fresh water, hot," while the latter seemed to prefer it "in salt water, cold." He added that the English had learned during that experience "how not to govern colonies." The

earl, being a conservative member of the house of lords, has enlightened me in regard to campaign issues and election methods and has also given me letters to a number of officials whom I desire to meet. Through Mr. Pease and Mr. Black I have arranged to hear Mr. Asquith, one of the free trade leaders in the parliamentary contest now in progress. He speaks near London next Thursday night. I hope to hear Mr. Chamberlain while in England.

Mr. Boulton has for several years been connected with the arbitration of differences between labor and capital, and conversed most instructively on that subject, as well as regarding the workingmen's clubs and other means employed for bettering the condition of the wage-earners.

Father O'Grady enlightened me on many matters connected with his religious work in South America, while Mr. Wetmore supplied statistics on grain transportation. All in all, the week on the boat has proved most beneficial and but for the necessity of an early return to the United States I would regret the separation that must take place at Liverpool tomorrow afternoon.

I shall mail this at Queenstown.

While darkness conceals the land, we can see the light houses on the Irish coast and feel that the ocean voyage is nearly ended. In the morning we will pass up St. George's channel with the land of Brian Boru on one side and Wales on the other. From now until the hour comes to re-embark I shall see and hear and learn, and from time to time give the readers of The Commoner the results of my observations.

European Letters

The following European Letters were written for and copyrighted by the Hearst newspapers, and are reproduced by courtesy of William Randolph Hearst.

European Letters

The Tariff Debate In England.

An American feels at home in England just now for he constantly reads in the newspapers and hears on the streets the tariff arguments so familiar in the United States. I can almost imagine myself in the midst of a presidential campaign, with import duties as the only issue. I have been especially fortunate in arriving here at the very height of the discussion and I have been privileged to hear the best speakers on both sides. Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, lately secretary for the colonies, left the cabinet some three months ago in order to present to the country the tariff policy which he believed to be necessary. Not desiring to make the government responsible for the proposition put forth by him he turned his official duties over to another and has been conducting one of the most remarkable campaigns that England has seen in recent years.

He enters the fight with a number of things to his credit. He is a great orator, he is pleasing in manner, experienced in debate, skillful in the arraignment of his adversaries, and possesses the faculty of so

holding the attention of his hearers as to make them eager to catch the next sentence. He is not an impassioned speaker, he has no grand climaxes that overwhelm an audience, but he does have what his friends call a "restrained eloquence" that leaves the impression that he never quite reaches the limit of his powers. He is a man who would rank high in any land and as an antagonist he would not fear to meet the best on any platform.

He is about five feet nine or ten inches in height and weighs about 175 pounds. He wears no beard and is impressive in appearance. The cartoonists take liberties with him as with other public men in drawings of him, and I may say in passing that there are some newspaper cartoonists over here who do excellent work.

Mr. Chamberlain is urging a departure from the free trade policy which England has followed for fifty years, and he defends his position on three grounds:

First—That it is needed for the protection of English manufacturers and English laborers.

Second—That it is necessary for the defense and strengthening of the empire.

Third—That a tariff can be used when necessary as a retaliatory weapon to make a breach in the tariff walls that other nations have erected.

In presenting the first proposition he employes the usual protectionist arguments. He appeals to particular industries and promises better wages to labor and more constant employment. He complains that foreign products are being "dumped" in Eng-

land. The foreigner is accused of selling his surplus wares here without profit or below cost while he sells for enough at home to enable him to carry on his business.

I heard Mr. Chamberlain's speech at Cardiff, the chief city of Wales. It was an audience largely made up of wage-earners, and his appeals were adroit and elicited an enthusiastic response. He dwelt at length on the tin industry; figured the growth of the industry from 1882 to 1892 and showed that during the next decade the tin industry had suffered by the establishment of tin plate mills in the United States.

He assumed that if the English government had been authorized to make reciprocal treaties it might have persuaded the United States to forego the protection of tin plate in exchange for trade advantages in some other direction. He estimated the loss that had come to Welsh workmen because of the lessened demand for their tin plate and he contended that it was necessary to give preferential treatment to the colonies in order to increase or even to hold their attachment to the empire.

In discussing retaliation he seemed to assume what the protectionists of the United States have often declared, namely, that the foreigner pays the tax; and his argument was that England ought to tax the goods coming in from other countries if other countries taxed goods imported from England. He has coined phrases that are going the rounds of the press, the most popular of which is embodied in the question, "If another nation strikes you with a tariff tax, are

you going to take it lying down?" This phrase aroused a spirit of pugnacity at Cardiff and was enthusiastically applauded.

In presenting the claims of the empire, Mr. Chamberlain occupies much the same position as the American protectionist who contends that a tariff wall makes our own country independent of other nations. In presenting this argument the late colonial secretary has the advantage of the great popularity which he won during the South African war, the spirit of empire being just now quite strong in England.

So much for the leader of the tariff reform movement, for strange as it may seem the English crusade for the adoption of a tariff is being conducted through the Tariff Reform League, which, with Mr. Chamberlain's endorsement, is asking for a campaign fund of $500,000.

On the other side are, first, the conservatism that supports the settled policy of half a century; second, the political and economic arguments which weigh against a protective tariff, and, third, the ability and personal influence of the men who are arrayed against Mr. Chamberlain. I have attended a number of meetings of the opposition. The first was at St. Neots, Huntingtonshire, where I heard Mr. H. H. Asquith, one of the liberal leaders in parliament. He is of about the same height as Mr. Chamberlain, but heavier, his face and shoulders being considerably broader. Mr. Asquith differs very materially from Mr. Chamberlain in his style of oratory, but is a master in his line. His is more the argument of the lawyer. He is more logical and a closer reasoner. He

is regarded as one of the ablest public men in England, and after listening to him for an hour I could easily believe his reputation to be well-earned.

While he discussed with thoroughness all phases of the fiscal question, I was most impressed with his reply to what may be called the imperial part of Mr. Chamberlain's argument. He insisted that preferential duties would weaken instead of strengthen the bonds that unite England to her colonies because partiality could not be shown to one industry without discrimination against the other industries, and he warned the advocates of protection not to divide the people of the colonies and the people of the home country into warring factions and suggested that when these factions were arrayed against each other in a contest for legislative advantage, the harmony of the nation would be disturbed and ill-will between the various sections, elements and industries engendered.

At a house dinner of the National Liberal club in London I heard another member of parliament, Mr. R. S. Robson, a liberal, who took retaliation for his subject. Mr. Robson presented a clear, comprehensive and concise analysis of the policy of retaliation; the strongest points made by him being, first, that retaliation meant commercial war, and, second, that it contemplated a permanent policy of protection. He pointed out that no country had ever aimed a retaliatory tariff at England; that tariffs in other countries were laid for domestic purposes and not out of antagonism to another country. He contended that other countries instead of modifying their tariffs because

of attempted retaliation on the part of England would be more likely excited to an unfriendliness which they had not before shown, and that if England were the aggressor, in such a tariff war she must necessarily be a large loser. He said that it was impossible to conceive of concessions being secured by a threat to raise a tariff wall in England. It would be necessary, he contended, if a retaliatory policy was undertaken to first impose a high tariff all around and then offer to reduce it in special cases. This would be a radical departure from the policy of free trade and would bring with it all the evils that had led to the abandonment of a protective policy under the leadership of Cobden.

Besides the liberal opposition, Mr. Chamberlain has to meet the antagonism of a number of influential leaders who would indorse Mr. Balfour if he only proposed retaliation in a particular case where an open and grievous blow had been struck at England, but who are not willing to join Mr. Chamberlain in advocating a return to a protective policy.

I attended a great meeting held under the auspices of the Free Food League and heard speeches delivered by the Duke of Devonshire and Lord Goshen. I was told that the duke was the only English statesman who ever took a nap during the progress of his own speech. Thus fore-warned, I was prepared for a season of rest, but the duke surprised his friends (and they are many) on this occasion and his speech has been the talk of the country since it was delivered. It was a powerful arraignment of the pro-

posed tax on food, and taking into consideration the high standing and great prestige of the duke, will exert a widespread influence on the decision of the controversy. The duke is a tall, strongly built man, with a long head and full sandy beard sprinkled with gray. He speaks with deliberation and emphasis, but lacks the graces of the other orators whom I had an oportunity to hear. If, however, ease and grace were wanting, the tremendous effectiveness of the pile driver and the battering ram make up for them.

He denounced the proposition to put a tax upon the people's food as a blow to the welfare and greatness of the nation. He scouted the idea that the tax would not ultimately extend to all food or that it would not raise the price of food and showed that the increase in the cost of food and clothing would take from the laboring man any advantage which Mr. Chamberlain promised to bring by his protective policy.

At the Free Food meeting the duke was followed by Lord Goshen, a conspicuous leader of the unionist party. Though now about seventy years old, he possesses great vitality and entered into the discussion with an earnestness that bespeaks the extraordinary power of the man. In appearance he reminded me of Gladstone and of Paul Kruger. I should say that his face had some of the characteristics of both—rugged in its outlines and giving an impression of courage and strength combined with great intellect. He replied to Mr. Chamberlain's challenge, "Will you take it lying down?" with the question, "Will you

hide behind a wall?" He denied that it was necessary for the Briton to build a barricade and conceal himself behind it.

In reply to the argument that the Englishman needed protection from the foreigner, he gave statistics to show that Germany, one of the protected countries to which Mr. Chamberlain constantly refers, had an increasing number of the unemployed. His reference to the increased consumption of horse meat in Germany and the decrease in the consumption of other kinds of meat met with a response that seems likely to make "No horse meat" a slogan in the campaign.

The last meeting which I attended was that at which Lord Rosebery made his reply to Mr. Chamberlain. Lord Rosebery meets Mr. Chamberlain on an equal footing. He is about the same height, but a trifle stouter. He is an orator of great distinction, graceful, polished, of wide learning and great experience, and he possesses a wit that enables him to keep his audience in constant good humor. He has been prime minister and enjoys great popularity. His reception at the Surrey theatre, South London, was as cordial as Mr. Chamberlain's reception at Cardiff. With all the arts of the orator he repelled the attacks of Mr. Chamberlain and arraigned the policy of the conservatives. He denied that there was any excuse, to use his words, for the "lamentations of the modern Jeremiah," His lordship declared that the country had made great progress under the policy of free commerce with the world and that England had the

world for her granary and depicted the possible consequences if she attempted to wage war against those who furnished her bread and meat.

He declared that the colonies could not supply the food that the people of England needed, but called Mr. Chamberlain's attention to the fact that Canada was "dumping" more iron into England than any of the protected countries complained of. He arraigned the conservative government's large and increasing expenditures and suggested that the government might better lessen the taxes upon the people than impose new taxes upon their food and clothing.

He closed with an appeal for more technical instruction; for a better understanding of the needs of their customers, and for a more earnest effort for the physical, intellectual and moral advancement of the people.

I will not attempt to predict the outcome of this fiscal controversy. I have missed my guess on a similar controversy in the United States and I shall not venture a prophecy in a foreign land. Mr. Chamberlain's opponents believe that a return to protection would be taken as renunciation of England's ambition to be "mistress of the seas," and that it would presage commercial isolation. It is a battle of giants over a great question and all the world interested in the result.

November 29 was spent in Dublin, the 30th at Belfast and enroute to that city from Dublin. Dublin is a very substantial looking city and much more ancient in appearance than Belfast, the latter reminding one more of an enterprising American city. We did not have a chance to visit any of the industries of Dublin, and only a linen factory and a shipyard in Belfast, but as the linen factory, the York Street Linen Mills, was one of the largest in Ireland, and the shipyard, Harland & Wolff's, the largest in the world, they gave some idea of the industrial possibilities of the island.

The lord mayor of Belfast, Sir Daniel Dixon, gave us a history of the municipal undertakings and extended to us every possible courtesy. To one accustomed to the farms of the Mississippi and the Missouri valleys, the little farms of Ireland seemed contracted indeed, but what they lack in size, they make up in thoroughness of cultivation. Not a foot seemed to be wasted. At Birmingham I saw some Kerry cows, which I can best describe as pony cattle, that they told me were being bred in Ireland in preference to the larger breeds; they are certainly more in keeping with the size of the farms. The farm houses are not large, but from the railroad train they looked neat and well kept.

My visit to Ireland was too brief to enable me to look into the condition of the tenants in the various parts of the island, but by the courtesy of the lord mayor of Dublin, Mr. Timothy Harrington, and Mr. John Dillon, both members of parliament, I met a number of the prominent representatives of Ireland in national politics. A luncheon at the Mansion House was attended by some 75 of the Irish leaders, including Archbishop Walsh, John Redmond, John Dillon, Michael Davitt, William Field, Patrick O'Brien, several members of the city council, ex-Mayor Valentine Dillon, High Sheriff Thomas Powers, and Drs. McArdle and Cox, and other persons distinguished in various walks of life.

The dinner at Mr. Dillon's gave me a chance to meet Mr. Bailey of the new land commission and Mr. Finucane, lately connected with the Indian department, and to become better acquainted with the more prominent of the Irish leaders whose names have become familiar to American readers, and whom I met at luncheon.

Archbishop Walsh is one of the best known and most beloved of the Irish clergy, and he endeared himself to the friends of bimetallism throughout the world by the pamphlet which he wrote some years ago setting forth the effect of the gold standard upon the Irish tenant farmer. It was a genuine pleasure to make his personal acquaintance. It may be added, in passing, that the tenants of Ireland will be more than ever interested in the stable dollar when they have secured title to their lands and assumed the pay-

ments which extend over more than sixty years. Any increase in the value of the dollar would increase the burden of these payments by lessening the price which they would obtain for the products of the soil.

Mr. John Redmond is the leader of the Irish party in parliament, and having visited the United States, is personally known to many of our people. He has the appearance of a well-to-do lawyer, is quick to catch a point, ready of speech and immensely popular with his people. He has the reputation of being one of the most forcible of the Irish orators, and I regret that I had no opportunity of hearing him speak.

Mr. Dillon is a tall man, probably six feet one, with a scholarly face and wears a beard. His long experience in parliament, his thorough knowledge of the issues of the last quarter of a century, and his fidelity to the interests of the people of his land have given him a deservedly high place among the great Irishmen of the present generation.

Mr. Michael Davitt has also had a conspicuous career, but is not now in parliament, having resigned as a protest against the Boer war. He is the oldest of the group and shows in his countenance the fighting qualities that have made his name known throughout the world. He is not a diplomat—he has not learned the language of the court. He is not a compromiser, but a combatant, and his blows have been telling ones.

The lord mayor of Dublin, Mr. Timothy Harrington, has been honored with a third election as lord mayor, a position first held by Daniel O'Connell,

but he is always at Westminster whenever there is an important vote in parliament. He is a typical Irishman, good-natured, full of humor, well informed and a natural politician.

At a dinner given a few days later at the National Liberal club in London by Mr. T. P. O'Connor, I met several other Irish members, among them Mr. William Redmond, brother of the leader of the Irish party, and himself a man of great ability and long parliamentary experience, and James Devlin, one of the most brilliant of the orators of the younger generation. The oldest person at the O'Connor dinner was Mr. O'Brien, the last Irishman who enjoyed the distinction of being sentenced to be hung, drawn and quartered. The host, Mr. O'Connor, while he represents a Liverpool constituency and is not, therefore, technically speaking, a member of the Irish party, is one of the most prominent and influential of the Irishmen in the house of commons. He has lectured in the United States as well as in Europe, and is now editor of two weekly papers of large circulation. He showed his friendliness toward America and his appreciation of our country's resources by taking unto himself an American wife—a beautiful Texan.

At Glasgow I met another member of parliament, Mr. William McKillup, who, though a citizen of Glasgow represents an Irish district and takes an active interest in everything that affects the Emerald isle.

Mr. Harrington and Mr. Redmond took me to the Dublin cemetery and we visited the graves of

O'Connell and Parnell. The tomb of Ireland's great agitator is under a massive pile of granite, made to represent an old Irish tower. No monument has yet been erected to Parnell. The memory of the two dead statesmen and the presence of the living leaders recalled the struggle to which so many of Ireland's sons have devoted their lives, and it was a matter of extreme gratification to find that substantial progress is being made.

It is true that home rule has not yet been secured, but the contest for home rule has focused attention upon the industrial and political condition of Erin, and a number of remedial measures have been adopted. First, the tenant was given title to his improvements and then the amount of the rent was judicially determined. More recently the authorities have been building cottages for the rural laborers. Over 15,000 of these cottages have been already erected and arrangements are being made for some 19,000 more. These are much more comfortable than the former dwellings, and much safer from a sanitary point of view. The recent land purchase act, which went into effect on November 1, seems likely to exert a very great influence upon the condition of the people. According to its terms the government is to buy the land of the landlord and sell it to the tenants. As the government can borrow money at a lower rate than the ordinary borrower, it is able to give the tenant much better terms than he gets from his present landlord, and at the same time purchase the land of the landlord at a price that is equitable. The landlords are showing a disposition to

comply with the spirit of the law, although some of them are attempting to get a larger price for their land than it was worth prior to the passage of the law. The purpose of the law is to remove from politics the landlord question, which has been a delicate one to deal with. Most of the larger estates were given to the ancestors of the present holders and many of the owners live in England and collect their rents through a local agent. The new law makes the government the landlord and the tenant, by paying a certain annual sum for 63 years, becomes the owner of the fee. He has the privilege of paying all or any part, at any time, and can dispose of his interest. The settlement which is now being effected, not only removes the friction which has existed between the tenant and the landlord, but puts the tenant in a position where he can appeal to the government with reasonable certainty of redress in case unforeseen circumstances make his lot harder than at present anticipated. The assurance that he will become the owner of the fee will give to the Irish farmer an ambition that has heretofore been wanting, for he will be able to save without fear of an increase in the rent. Not only is the land question in process of settlement, but there have been at the same time other improvements which make for the permanent progress of the people. There is a constant increase in educational facilities, and a large number of co-operative banks have been established. Agricultural societies have been formed for the improvement of crops and stock, and the trend is dictinctly upward. The Irish leaders have not ob-

tained all that they labored for—there is much to be secured before their work is complete, but when the history of Ireland is written, the leaders now living will be able to regard with justifiable pride the results of their devotion and sacrifice and their names will be added to the long list of Irish patriots and statesmen.

In Dublin I paid my respects to Lord Dudley, lieutenant governor of Ireland, whose residence, the Viceregal Lodge, is in Phoenix Park, and found him so genial and affable a host that I am led to hope that in his administration of the executive branch of the government he will make the same attempt at just treatment that parliament has made in the enactment of the recent land measure.

There is a general desire among the leaders of thought in Ireland to check the emigration from that country. They feel that Ireland under fair conditions can support a much larger population than she now has. Ireland, they say, has been drained of many of its most enterprising and vigorous sons and daughters. It is hardly probable that the steps already taken will entirely check the movement toward the United States, but there is no doubt that the inhabitants of Ireland and their friends across the water contemplate the future with brighter hopes and anticipations than they have for a century.

Growth of Municipal Ownership.

Carved in the mantle of the library which adjoins the reception room of the lord provost of Glasgow is the motto, "Truth will prevail," and the triumph of truth is illustrated in the development of municipal ownership in the British Isles.

Probably no city in the world has extended the sphere of municipal activity further than the metropolis of Scotland—Glasgow. By the courtesy of the present lord provost, Sir James Ure Primrose, I learned something of the manner in which the city of Glasgow is administering the work that in most of our American cities have been left to private corporations. It goes without saying that Glasgow owns and operates its water system, for that is usually the first public work that a city enters upon. In this case, however, the water instead of being furnished to the citizens at so much per thousand gallons or at fixed hydrant rates, is paid for by a tax upon the value of the property. The city's water supply is brought from Lake Katrine, forty miles away, and the city has recently laid a second pipe line to the lake.

Glasgow also owns the gas plant and furnishes gas to consumers at about 50 cents per thousand cubic feet. More recently the city has entered upon the work of supplying electricity both to the city and to private houses. The tramways, too, are owned and

operated by the municipality. The service is excellent and the fare depends upon the distance traveled, 2d (4 cents) being the rate for a long ride and 1d (2 cents) for shorter distances. At certain hours in the day there are work trams that carry the laboring man from one end of the city to the other for ½d or 1 cent. The lord provost informed me that it was the settled policy of the city to use all the income from public service corporations in improving the service and lessening the charge. In some places the surplus, as will be shown hereafter, is turned into the city fund and to that extent lessens the taxes (or rates as city taxes are called in Great Britain). The municipal authorities in Glasgow have from the beginning opposed this form of indirect taxation and insisted that the service should be rendered to the public at absolute cost, leaving the people to support the city government by direct taxation.

Not only does Glasgow furnish water, gas, electricity and street car service to its people at cost, but it has undertaken other work still further in advance of American cities. It has built a number of model tenement houses for the poor and rents them at something less than the rate private individuals charge for similar quarters. These buildings have had for their primary object the improvement of the sanitary condition of the city. Slums in which disease was rife have been bought, cleansed and built up with the result that the death rate has been reduced in those localities. These tenement houses are rented by the week or month and the charge for those that I visited was about $36 per

year, this covering taxes and water. The rooms are commodious and well lighted and each suite contains a cooking range fitted into the chimney place.

The city has also established a number of lodging houses for single men and here lodgings can be obtained ranging from 3 1-2d (7 cents) to 4 1-2d (9 cents) per night. The lodger has the privilege and most of them take advantage of it, of cooking his meals in a large kitchen connected with the building, and also has the use of the dining room and reading room. One lodging house is set apart for widowers with children and is, I am informed, the only one of its kind in the world. About one hundred families, including in all 300 persons, have rooms here. Attendants are on duty to look after the children during the day, while the fathers are at work and meals are furnished to such as desire them at a minimum rate.

The reading public is already familiar with the public baths which have for a number of years been in operation in Glasgow, and to these baths have been added public wash houses where women can bring the family linen and at the rate of 2d per hour make use of the tubs and drying room. I visited one of these wash-rooms and found that the number of people taking advantage of it during the first year was, in round numbers 33,000, in the second year 34,000, in the third year 35,000, and in the fourth year 37,000.

London is also making progress in the work of municipalizing its public service. The city proper covers a very small territory, in fact, but a mile square, the greater part of the city being under the control

of what is called the London county council. The London city council has recently obtained from parliament the right to deal with the water problem and a commission has been created for this purpose and is now at work appraising the value of the different water companies which are to be taken over by the said council. The enormous price demanded by these companies gives overwhelming proof of London's folly in having so long delayed the undertaking of this public work. As there are no surface street cars in the city of London, the city council has not had the tramway question to deal with. The London county council has moved much more rapidly than the city council, and I am indebted to Mr. John Burns, M. P., also councilman for the district of Battersea, for much valuable information on this subject. He and Mr. A. J. Shepheard, with whom I crossed the ocean, being kind enough to introduce me to the members of the county council and to place before me the statistics in possession of the officials. The county council besides taking over the water service is also furnishing to some extent electricity. Just now the county council is putting down tramways and preparing to follow in the footsteps of Glasgow in the matter of furnishing transit for its citizens. Like Glasgow, the county council is also furnishing lodging houses for the poorer classes and by so doing is improving the sanitary conditions of the city. In some portions the council is erecting tenement houses, here as in Glasgow the council selecting the worst portions of the city and substituting modern and well-equipped houses for the unsightly and unhealthy tene-

ment houses that formerly occupied the ground. Mr. Burns took me through one of these sections where about four thousand people are being provided with homes with every modern improvement and at very low rental. Finding that the death rate among the children of the poor was alarmingly great, the county council established a sterilized milk station and the death rate among the children has been very materially decreased.

Nottingham, England, was visited on the invitation of Mr. A. W. Black, until recently mayor. I became acquainted with him on the passage across the Atlantic, and found that he had interested himself in the work of extending the municipal control of public utilities. From him and the town clerk, Sir Samuel Johnson, I learned that the city had been furnishing water to its citizens for about thirty years and gas for a still longer time. The price of gas has been reduced from time to time until it is now about 50 cents per thousand for private citizens, and even at this low rate the gas plant pays into the city treasury a net profit of about $120,000 a year. It is only about five years since the city entered upon the work of furnishing electricity, but the profit from that source is now nearly $45,000 annually. The city has recently taken over the tramways and notwithstanding that it has raised the wages of the employes, shortened their hours of labor, improved the service, extended the lines and reduced the fares, it has now derived about $90,000 profit from the earnings of the tramways. This has been the rule wherever private services have been

undertaken by the municipalities. Nottingham has a population of about 250,000.

I have taken these cities as an illustration, they being the ones concerning which I have investigated most carefully.

Birmingham furnishes water and light to its people, and has just decided to take charge of the tramway service. It already owns the tracks, but has been allowing private corporations to run the cars. The people have decided to operate the lines in the future.

In Belfast, I found that the city had decided to take charge of the tramway tracks, the only disputed question being whether the city would pledge itself to the permanent operation of the lines or reserve the right to permit private corporations to use the tracks.

Nothing has impressed me more in my visit to the British Isles than the interest which the leading citizens of the various municipalities are taking in problems of government and sociology. It must be remembered that here the members of the city councils receive no pay. The work that they do is entirely gratuitous, and I have found that the councils are composed of representatives of all classes of society.

Many of the successful business men, professional men and educators are to be found devoting a portion of their time, sometimes a very considerable portion to the work of the city. They attend meetings, serve on committees and carry on investigations, and find their recompense not in a salary, but in the honor

which attaches to the position and in the consciousness that they are giving something of value to their fellows.

The fact that English cities are doing the work that in American cities is largely let out to private corporations may explain the relative absence of corruption as compared with some of our American cities, but there is no doubt that among the people generally service in the city government is more highly regarded than it is in most the large cities of the United States.

I observed with interest the enthusiasm manifested by the officials in the work being done by the respective cities. At Birmingham, Mr. Roland H. Barkley, a member of the city council, by request of the lord mayor, called upon me, and not only showed great familiarity with the work of the city government, but manifested an intense desire to secure for his city the methods that had been shown by experience to be the best.

Mr. Black, recently mayor of Nottingham, is a very successful lace manufacturer, and yet he seemed as much concerned about the affairs of the city as about the details of his own business. Lord Mayor Harrington of Dublin, Lord Mayor Dixon of Belfast and Lord Provost Primrose of Glasgow, were all alive to the importance of their work, and seemed to make the discharge of their duties their chief concern.

In this connection, I desire to record my appreciation of the public service of one of the most

interesting and agreeable men whom I have met in the Old World, Mr. John Burns. He began his industrial life at the age of ten as a maker of candles. He was afterwards apprenticed as a machinist, and after acquiring proficiency in his trade followed that line of employment until his associates made him their representative in the city government. He was soon afterwards sent to parliament, and has for some fifteen years represented his district in both bodies. He is only 45, but his hair and beard are so streaked with gray that one would think him ten years older. He is a little below medium height, strongly built, and very active and energetic. A diligent student, quick-witted and effective in speech, it is not surprising that he stands today among the world's foremost representatives of the wage-earners. He is opposed to both drinking and gambling. He receives no salary either as a member of the county council or as a member of parliament, but is supported by his association which pays him what is equivalent to a thousand dollars a year. With this very meagre income he devotes his life to public work, and I have not met a more conscientious or unselfish public servant. And yet what Mr. Burns is doing on a large scale, many others are doing in a lesser degree.

I wish that all the citizens of my country could come into contact with the public men whom I have met, and catch something of the earnestness with which they are applying themselves to the solution of the municipal problems that press upon the present generation. It would certainly increase the velocity

of American reforms, and arouse that latent patriotism which only needs arousing to cope successfully with all difficulties.

While it may seem that the leaders of municipal government in Europe are somewhat altruistic in their labors, there is a broader sense in which they are quite selfish, but it is that laudable selfishness which manifests itself in one's desire to lift himself up, not by dragging down others or doing injustice to others, but by lifting up the level upon which all stand. Those who add to the comfort and happiness of their community are making their own lives and property more secure. Those who are endeavoring to infuse hope and ambition into the hearts of the hopeless and their children—are working more wisely than those who are so short-sighted as to believe that the accumulation of money is the only object of life.

Let us hope that the time is near at hand when the successful business men in the United States, instead of continuing their accumulations to the very end of life, will be satisfied with a competency and when this is secured give to their country the benefit of their experience, their intelligence and their conscience, as many of the business men of England, Scotland and Ireland are now doing.

My call upon President Loubet was the most interesting incident of my visit to France. It was arranged by General Horace Porter, American ambassador to France, who conducted us to the Elysee palace, which is the White house of the French republic.

President Loubet is probably the most democratic executive that Frane has ever had. He reminded me of our former President Benjamin Harrison and of another of our distinguished citizens, Andrew Carnegie—not exactly like either, but resembling both—the former in appearance, the latter in manner as well as appearance.

President Loubet is below the medium height, even of Frenchmen. His shoulders are broad and his frame indicative of great physical strength. His hair is snow white, as are also his beard and mustache. He wears his beard cut square at the chin.

His eyes are dark blue, suggesting that his hair and beard were blond before the years bleached them. His voice is soft, and he speaks with great vivacity, emphasizing his words by expressive gestures.

He received us in his working room, a beautiful semi-oval apartment, whose large windows open into the beautiful gardens attached to the Elysee palace. The oval end of the room bore great priceless Gobelin tapestry, depicting abundance. On a pedestal under

the tapestry was a marble bust of the Minerva-like head of the Goddess of Liberty of the French republic.

The president's desk is a long, flat table, eminently business looking, covered with papers and lighted by two desk lamps and green shades. A huge electrolier dependent from the frescoed ceiling filled the room with light.

The president wore a frock coat, the tri-colored button of the Legion of Honor adorning the lapel.

President Loubet is a very cordial man, and takes pride in the fact that, like most of our American presidents, he has worked his way up from the ranks of the common people. His father was a farmer near the vilage of Montelimar.

Young Loubet studied law, and then public affairs. He has held nearly every office in the gift of the people. He began as mayor of Montelimar, where his aged mother still lives in the old farmhouse.

He was elected a deputy in 1876, and in 1886 was elected to the senate. He was minister of public works in 1887, and minister of the interior in 1892. In 1895 he was elected president of the senate, and in 1899 he was elected president of the republic.

He talked freely on various questions that came up for consideration, and showed himself to be thoroughly informed upon the economic as well as the political questions with which France has to deal. His personal popularity and strong good sense have been of inestimable value to his country in the trying times caused by the Dreyfus case.

President Loubet has been prominently connected with the bimetallic movement, and shows himself familiar with the principles upon which bimetallists rely in their defense of that system of finance.

The president, like all the Frenchmen whom I met, feels very friendly toward the United States, and it goes without saying that France under his administration is not likely to do anything at which our country can take just offense.

It was gratifying to me to hear him express so much good will, for it was evidence of the attachment which the French people feel toward those republican principles of government which they have established by so much struggle and sacrifice.

Municipal ownership has not made as much progress in France as in England, although most of the cities now own their water works, and some of them their lighting plants. The railroads are nearly all owned by private corporations, but they operate under charters running about 100 years, half of which time has now elapsed.

According to the charters, the government guaranteed a certain rate of interest on the investment, besides a certain contribution to the sinking fund, and at the end of the charter the roads become the property of the state.

Although it is nearly fifty years before the charters expire, the course to be adopted by the government is already being discussed, some insisting that the government should take over the roads and operate them—others favoring an arrangement that will

continue private operation, although the government will be owner of the property. The same difference of opinion to be found in our own country is to be found here, and some of the high officials are strongly opposed to the government entering upon the operation of the roads.

President Loubet spoke with evident gratification of the general diffusion of wealth in France. He said that they had few men of large fortunes, but a great many men of moderate means, and he felt that the republic was to be congratulated upon the fact that the resources of the country are so largely in the hands of the people.

He explained that the government loans were taken by the people in small sums and subscribed many times over. Very few of the bonds representing the French debt are held outside of France. The debt furnishes a sort of savings bank for the citizens, and their eagerness to invest in "rentes" (the government bonds) is proof of their patriotism as well as of their thrift.

I heard so much of the French peasant that I devoted one day to a visit into the country. Going out some fifty miles from Paris I found a village of about eighty families. Selecting a representative peasant, I questioned him about the present condition and prospects of the French farmer. I found that about three-fourths of the peasants of that village owned their homes, but that only about one-fourth owned the farms they tilled.

I should explain that the French peasants do not

as a rule live upon the farms, as is the custom in the United States. With us, whether a farmer owns forty acres or a quarter section, he usually lives upon the land, and the houses are therefore scattered at intervals over the country.

The French peasants, on the contrary, are inclined to gather in villages most of them owning their houses and gardens, but going out into the country to cultivate their fields. Sometimes a peasant will have a vineyard in one direction from his home, a pasture in another and a wheat or beet field in yet another direction.

These fields are sometimes owned, but more often are rented. The landlord aims to get about 4 per cent annually on his investment. The tenant, however, pays the taxes, which sometimes amount to 1 or 2 per cent more.

The peasants complain that the horses which they need to cultivate their crops are made more expensive by the increased consumption of horse-flesh as food, the demand having raised the price of horses.

The same cause has operated, so I was informed, to reduce the price of cattle. The widespread use of automobiles has lessened the price of straw in Paris, and this has been felt by the wheat growers.

I found the peasant with whom I talked to be an ardent protectionist. He spoke as if the farmers were driven to it as a last resort. As I was leaving he assured me that he was glad to speak to a "republican" and said he would not have talked to me at all if I had not been one.

This was an evidence of his loyalty to the existing regime in France and also gave additional proof of the fact that the republican party in the United States has an advantage in appealing to newly-arrived immigrants merely by reason of its name.

Foreigners are much better acquainted with the word "republic" than with the word "democracy," and I find that republican speakers have taken advantage of this fact and represented the republican party as the only exponent of the doctrines of a republic.

The New York Independent about a year ago printed the autobiography of a foreign born citizen, who presented the same idea and told of a republican speech in which this argument was made by the orator.

The birth rate in France scarcely exceeds the death rate, and to my surprise I found that the increase in the country was even less than in Paris, in proportion to the population. One Frenchman, apparently well informed, told me that there were small villages in which it was difficult to find a child.

In the village which I visited I was told that the families average two or three children. To show, however, that the small family was not the universal rule, attention was called to one family there in which there were eleven children.

The French peasant is a very industrious man and cultivates his land with great care, and as soon as he saves a little money he tries to add to the area of his farm. The wife is usually an efficient helper, whether

in the city or in the country. In the city she is often co-partner with her husband in the store, and assists him to save.

Whether the tendency of the peasants to gather in villages rather than to live each on his own farm is due to their sociability or is a relic of the feudal system, I cannot say—both reasons were given.

The French peasant has reason to feel the burden of militarism, but the recollection of the last war with Germany is so fresh in his mind that he is not likely to make any vigorous protest as long as he believes a large army necessary for the protection of the republic.

The sentiment of the French people on this subject is shown by the fact that the figure representing Alsace-Lorraine in the group of statues in the beautiful Place de la Concorde is always covered with mourning wreaths.

I visited the Bank of France, where I was received by the governor, M. Georges Pallain. The bank's capital stock is about $40,000,000, and it pays a dividend of about 12 per cent, equal to about 4 per cent on the present market value of the stock. The deposits are much smaller in proportion to the capital than are the deposits of our large American banks. This is true of the Bank of England, and likewise of the banks of Mexico.

This smaller proportion between the deposits and the capital stock arrested my attention because in the United States the proportion is sometimes so great as to leave little margin for shrinkage in the event of

industrial disturbance. If a bank has loans amounting to ten times its capital stock a shrinkage of one-tenth in the value of its assets would wipe out the capital.

The Bank of France, the Bank of England, and the leading banks of Mexico seem to be conducted on a more conservative basis. The Bank of England and the Bank of France differ largely in their note issues. The former has the right to issue uncovered notes to the extent of the bank's loan to the English government. Upon this loan the bank receives no interest, the note issue being considered an equivalent as no reserve is required to be kept against these notes. The bank can also issue notes in addition to these, but I found to my surprise that this note issue is not profitable to the bank, since these notes are virtually gold certificates, the bank being required to keep on hand an equal amount of gold as a redemption fund.

The Bank of France has outstanding nearly $900,000,000 in notes, which is the paper money of the country. The bank has the option of redeemnig these notes either in gold or silver, and it exercises that option by refusing to pay gold when gold becomes scarce, or when it seems undesirable to furnish gold for export.

It has recently refused gold, and those desiring to export that metal have had to purchase it at slight premium.

The "gold contract," which has become so common in the United States, and which was used to terrorize the public in 1896, seems to be unknown in

France; or at least I could find no one who knew anything about such contracts. They are regarded as contrary to public policy.

The president of the Bank of France is appointed by the government, so that the bank stands in a different attitude toward the government from the national banks of our country.

I had the pleasure of meeting a number of prominent Frenchmen during my visit to Paris, among them Senator Combes, the prime minister, who is just now a most conspicuous figure in the contest between the government and the various religious orders; Senator Clemenceau, one of the ablest editors in Paris, and a brilliant conversationalist; Baron d'Estonelles de Constant, a man of high ideals and leader of the peace movement in France; the Rev. Albert Kohler, author of "The Religion of Effort," and the Rev. Charles Wagner, whose book, "The Simple Life," has had such large circulation in the United States.

The Rev. Mr. Wagner is just such a looking man as you would expect to write such a book—strong, rugged and earnest. He impresses you as a man with a mission, and although young in years he has already made an impress upon the thought of the world. His book is a protest against the materialism which is making man the slave of his possessions.

The influence which Mr. Wagner has already exerted shows the power of a great thought, even when it must cross the boundaries of nations and pass through translation into many different tongues. I shall remember my communion with this apostle of

simplicity as one remembers a visit to a refreshing spring.

Dr. Max Nordau, the famous author of "Degeneracy," although a German, lives in Paris. I enjoyed my call upon him very much. One quickly recognizes the alertness of his mind, his brilliant powers of generalization and his aptness in epigram. I also had the pleasure of meeting Senator Fougeirol, a noted advocate of bimetallism.

The visitor to Paris is immediately impressed by the magnificence of the city's boulevards, parks and public squares. There is an elegant spaciousness about the boulevards and squares that surpasses anything I have seen elsewhere.

Parisians assert that the Avenue des Champs Elysees is the finest in the world, and so far as my observation goes I am not prepared to dispute the claim. The beauty of Paris deserves all the adjectives that have been lavished upon it.

One might dwell at length upon the almost endless array of brilliant shop windows where jewelry, bric-a-brac, hats, gowns and mantles are displayed (and I am not surprised that Paris is the Mecca for women), but I desire to refer briefly to the more permanent beauty of Paris--the beauty of its architecture, sculptures and paintings.

Paris' public buildings, ancient and modern, combine solidity with beauty. The statutes, columns and arches that adorn the parks and boulevards bespeak the skill of the artists and the appreciation of the public which pays for their maintenance.

Paris' many picture galleries, chief of which are the Louvre and the Luxembourg, contain, as all the world knows, extraordinary collections of treasures of art. The encouragement given by the government to every form of art has made Paris the abode of students from the four corners of the earth.

The huge palaces at Versailles and Fountainebleau are interesting relics of the monarchical period, and they are instructive also, in that they draw a contrast between the days of the empire and the present time. The extremes of society have been drawn closer together by the growth of democracy, and the officials chosen by the people and governing by authority of the people are much nearer to the people who pay the taxes and support the government than the kings who lived in gorgeous palaces and claimed to rule by right divine.

I have left to the last those reminders of earlier France, which are connected with the reigns of Napoleon. You cannot visit Paris without being made familiar with the face of the "Little Corsican," for it stares at you from the shop windows and looks down at you from the walls of palaces and galleries.

You see the figure of "the man of destiny" in marble and bronze, sometimes on a level with the eye, sometimes piercing the sky, as it does in the Place Vendome, where it is perched on top of a lofty column, whose pedestal and sides are covered with panels in relief made from cannon captured by Napoleon in battle.

The gigantic Arch of Triumph on the Champs Elysees, commenced by Napoleon, in commemoration

of his successes, testifies to the splendor of his conceptions.

But overshadowing all other Napoleonic monuments is his tomb on the banks of the Seine, adjoining the Invalides. Its gilded dome attracts attention from afar, and on nearer approach one is charmed with the strength of its walls and the symmetry of its proportions.

At the door the guard cautions the thoughtless to enter with uncovered head, but the admonition is seldom necessary, for an air of solemnity pervades the place.

In the center of the rotunda, beneath the frescoed vault of the great dome, is a circular crypt. Leaning over the heavy marble balustrade I gazed on the massive sarcophagus below, which contains all that was mortal of that marvellous combination of intellect and will.

The sarcophagus is made of dark red porphyry, a fitly chosen stone that might have been colored by the mingling of the intoxicating wine of ambition with the blood spilled to satisfy it.

Looking down upon the sarcophagus and the stands of tattered battle flags that surround it, I reviewed the tragic career of this grand master of the art of slaughter, and weighed, as best I could, the claims made for him by his friends. And then I found myself wondering what the harvest might have been had Napoleon's genius led him along peaceful paths, had the soil of Europe been stirred by the ploughshare

rather than by his trenchant blade, and the reaping done by implements less destructive than his shot and shell.

Just beyond and above the entombed emperor stands a cross upon which hangs a life-sized figure of the Christ, flooded by a mellow lemon-colored light, which pours through the stained glass windows of the chapel.

I know not whether it was by accident or design that this god of war thus sleeps, as it were, at the very feet of the Prince of Peace.

Whether so intended or not, it will to those who accept the teachings of the sermon on the Mount, symbolize love's final victory over force and the triumph of that philosophy which finds happiness in helpful service and glory in doing good.

The Republic of Switzerland.

No wonder Switzerland is free. The beauty of the country inspires a love of native land and the mountains form a natural fortress behind which the Swiss people could withstand armies many times the size of their own. Nowhere can one find as great a variety of landscape in a day's ride by train as in Switzerland. The road from Berne via Chiasso, on the Italian border, to Italy passes along the shores of lakes whose transparent waters reflect the precipitous rocks that overhang them; by mountain streams that dash and foam madly as if anxious to escape from the solitude of the hills into the companionship of the larger waters of lake and sea, across the gorges, around the foothills and through the nine-mile tunnel of St. Gothard that pierces the mountain a mile beneath the summit, and then down into the valleys that widen out from the base of the Alps. This day's enthralling ride reminds one of a cinematographic film, so quickly do the views change and so different is each from the other. Along the lower levels are tiny farms and vineyards, a little higher up are terraced pastures and quaint farm houses, with gabled roofs—often residence and barn are under the same roof! The mountain sides are scarred with the chutes down which the peasants drag timber on the snow. One passes through a great variety of climate in descending from the City of Mexico to Vera Cruz, but

there one does not see such a succession of picturesque views as greets the eye in the ride across the Alps.

One would suppose that the people of Switzerland could find ample employment in supplying the wants of those who temporarily visit their land, drawn by its unusual attractions for the tourist, but to the industry of hotelkeeping are added two that have made Switzerland famous throughout the world—watchmaking and wood carving. While watches are manufactured as well and as cheaply in the United States as in Switzerland, this industry is one that makes its presence known in every city of this mountain republic. The genius of the Swiss for wood carving manifests itself in innumerable ways. The cuckoo clock and the bear—the symbol of Switzerland, as the eagle is of the United States—are seen in shop windows everywhere; the bear in innumerable postures, the clock in innumerable sizes. At Berne I found some wooden nut-crackers formed to resemble a head, the lower jaw working as a lever and crushing the nut against the upper jaw. I observed one nut-cracker made to resemble President Roosevelt, and another former Colonial Secretary Chamberlain of England. I presume that the manufacturer intended to suggest that these two statesmen have more nuts to crack just now than any other men of political prominence!

More interesting, however, than its scenery or its industries is the government of Switzerland. It is the most democratic government on the face of the earth, if the word democratic is taken to mean the rule of the people, for in Switzerland the people rule more

completely than anywhere else. In some of the small cantons the people meet at stated times and act upon political matters in public meeting, recalling the old town hall meeting of New England. In all the cantons and in the federal government they have the initiative and referendum. The latter has been in use since 1874; the former has been adopted more recently.

From the courteous assistant secretary of state I learned that during the last twenty-nine years 235 federal laws have been submitted to the people by means of the referendum, of which 210 were adopted and twenty-five rejected. The total voting population of Switzerland is about 768,000, and it requires a petition signed by 30,000—less than 5 per cent of the voting population—to secure a referendum vote on any bill. Fifty thousand voters can petition for the enactment of any desired law, and when such a petition is filed the federal legislature can either pass the law or refuse to pass it. If it refuses, however, its action must be passed upon by a referendum vote. Since the existence of this provision six petitions have been presented, and in every case the legislature refused to pass the law demanded by the petitioners. In five cases the people at the referendum vote sustained the leislature; in one case the action of the legislature was overruled by the voters. In this instance the people had petitioned for the passage of a law that would prevent the slaughter of animals for food until after they had been rendered insensible.

I found that the Swiss people are so pleased with the popular control over government given them by

the initiative and referendum, that there is no possibility that any party will attempt to attack it, although there are some that would prefer the representative system freed from the restraint which the initiative and referendum give. Their arguments are, first, that the legislators knowing that the people can initiate legislation feel less responsibility; and, second, that as the legislators' actions can be reviewed by the people, the legislators are more timid about introducing needed reforms. The friends of the initiative and referendum meet these arguments by declaring that the legislators are really not relieved from responsibility, but on the other hand are incited to action by the fact that the people can act in the event that their interests are neglected by the legislature and that the timidity suggested is only likely to prevent legislation when the legislators themselves doubt the merit of the proposed action.

By courtesy of the American minister, Mr. Hill, I had the honor of meeting Dr. Adolphe Deucher, "president of the Swiss confederation," as he is styled. He is of German blood, as his name would indicate, and he is a fine representative of the scholarly, big-hearted Teuton. He is a tall, slender man, of about 60, with a ruddy face, white mustache and scanty white hair. He speaks with frankness and conviction and is as simple in his manners as the humblest of his people. He has been president once before, and has represented his canton in the federal legislature. He lives very unostentatiously, as becomes an official whose salary is only $2,750 a year. He receives $250 a year more than

his colleagues in the federal council. Switzerland has no executive mansion and the president lives in a modest hotel near the capitol.

Three languages are spoken in Switzerland—French, German, Italian. French prevails in the region about Geneva, German in and north of Berne and Italian at the southeast near the Italian border. German is perhaps dominant, if any one tongue can be said to dominate, with French and Italian following in the order named. The debates in the federal legislature are conducted in the three tongues, and are reported therein officially. No attempt is made to interfere with the teaching of the language that each of the three communities desires, the cantons being independent in matters of local legislation, just as are the states in our country. There seems to be no jealousy or enmity between the different sections except to the extent of a healthful rivalry between them. The feeling of independence, however, is so strong that no federal government could exist without a clear recognition of the rights of the component states or cantons.

As a nation, Switzerland with her five million people does not attract the attention that neighboring nations do, and in a contest at arms, except upon her own soil, she could not hope to achieve much, but in that high forum where conscience dictates and where reason rules she is a conspicuous member of the sisterhood of nations. If we believe the world to be making progress toward nobler national ideals, we may expect Switzerland to occupy a position of increasing importance, for the love of liberty that characterizes her

people, the democratic character of her institutions and the industry of her citizens all combine to give her assurance of increasing prestige.

I cannot refrain here from giving expression to a thought that has grown upon me since my arrival in Europe. I found our ambassador to England, Mr. Choate, preparing to leave his residence in Carlton House Terrace, London, because of the prospective return of its owner, Lord Curzon, from India. I learned that our ambassadors to France have often found difficulty in finding suitable houses in Paris, while I found that our minister to Switzerland, Mr. Hill, is living in Geneva because he has not been able thus far to find a residence in Berne, the capital. I was also informed that our ambassador to Italy, Mr. Meyer, was compelled to live in a hotel in Rome for a year after his appointment, because he was unable to find a suitable house for the embassy. The trials of our diplomatic representatives in Europe, together with the high rents they are compelled to pay for their residences, have convinced me that we as a people are at fault in not providing permanent and appropriate domiciles for our ambassadors and ministers at foreign capitals. In the great cities of Europe it is not only impossible to rent at a moderate price a house suitable for our embassy, but it is often difficult to secure a convenient location at any price. It is scarcely democratic toplace upon an official an expense so great as to preclude the appointment of a man of moderate means; nor does it comport with the dignity of our nation to make the choice of an ambassadorial or ministerial residence dependent upon chance and

circumstance. I have been pleased to observe that our representatives in Europe are conspicuous in the diplomatic circle at court functions because of their modest attire, but it is not necessary that our ambassadors' and ministers' homes should be on wheels in order to be democratic. I believe that our government ought to inaugurate a new policy in this matter and build in the chief capitals of foreign nations on land convenient to the foreign offices buildings suitable in every way for the residences and offices of our diplomatic representatives. Such buildings constructed according to a characteristic American style of architecture and furnished like an American home would not only give to our representative a fixed habitation, but would exhibit to the people of the country to which he is accredited the American manner of living. The records of the embassy could be kept more safely in permanent quarters.

As real estate in all the capitals of Europe is rapidly rising in value, land purchased now would become a profitable investment and the rent estimated upon the purchase price would be a great deal less than will have to be paid twenty or fifty years from now for a suitable site and buildings conveniently located. It is not wise to confine our diplomatic representation to the circle of the wealthy, and it is much better to furnish our ambassadors and ministers with residences than to increase their salaries.

THREE LITTLE KINGDOMS.

I shall treat in this article of my visit to three little kingdoms in the north of Europe—Denmark, Belgium and The Netherlands.

I passed through the edge of Sweden on my way from Berlin to Copenhagen and was at Malmoe a short time; but, as it was Christmas day and early in the morning, few stores were open, and I did not have an opportunity to see many people. I had intended to visit Stockholm, the capital of Sweden, but a day's delay in Russia deprived me of that pleasure.

Copenhagen is not only the capital of Denmark, but its commercial metropolis as well. The city has the air of a seaport. The canal leading from the harbor up to the center of the town was crowded with boats which had taken up their winter quarters and the multitude of masts told of the numbers of those who live upon the ocean.

Denmark is a densely populated country composed of the Jutland peninsula and a number of islands. The land is for the most part level and not much above the sea, but the farmers of Denmark have distinguished themselves in several departments of agriculture, especially in butter-making—Danish butter commanding the highest price in London and other large markets.

Copenhagen has some very substantial buildings and an art gallery in which the works of Thorwaldsen, the sculptor, occupy the chief place.

The people of Denmark, while living under an heriditary monarch, have a written constitution, and parliament is the controlling influence in the government. Until recently, the sovereign insisted upon selecting his cabinet ministers to suit himself; but, about three years ago, he yielded to the demand of parliament that the dominant party in that body be permitted to furnish the king's advisers. The change has proven so satisfactory that perfect harmony now exists between the royal family and the legislative body.

King Christian is advanced in years and is so beloved by his people that he goes among them without attendants or guards.

The heir to the throne of Denmark, Prince Frederick upon whom, by the courtesy of the American minister, Mr. Swensen, I was able to call on Christmas afternoon, is very democratic in his manner, and very cordial in his friendship for America.

If marrying her daughters to crowned heads is a test, the late Queen of Sweden was a very successful mother. One of her daughters is mother of the present emperor of Russia, another is wife of the present king of England, and a third is married to one of the smaller kings of Germany. A son, it may be added, is king of Greece.

I had the pleasure of meeting the prime minister and also Professor Matzen, the president of the state university and Denmark's member of The Hague tri-

bunal. He was one of the leading opponents of the transfer of the Danish islands to the United States.

I learned while in Denmark that one of the chief reasons for the opposition to the sale of the Danish islands to the United States was the fact that the United States did not guarantee full citizenship to the inhabitants of those islands. The nation's conduct elsewhere prevented this. Our refusal to give the Porto Ricans, and the Philippines the protection of the constitution, is largely to blame for the loss of the Danish islands to our country.

The Danish officials whom I met were deeply interested in the United States, and naturally so, for, like Sweden and Norway, Denmark has sent many sons and daughters to the United States; and these, as have the Swedes and Norwegians, have deported themselves so well as to establish close ties between the mother countries and their adopted land.

BELGIUM.

Belgium is a busy hive. Its people are crowded together and are very industrious. The farmers and truck gardeners have reduced agriculture to a fine art and the lace workers are famous for their skill.

Nowhere did I see man's faithful friend, the dog, utilized as in Belgium. He helps to haul the carts along the streets, and his services are so highly prized that large dogs are untaxed, while the small house dog, being an idler, has to contribute his annual quota to the expenses of the government.

The elegance of some of the public buildings and the beauty of the streets of Brussels surprise one if he has allowed himself to judge Belgium by her dimensions on the map. Historical interest, however, is centered, not in Brussels, but in the battlefield of Waterloo, some miles away. In the summer time, thousands of tourists (among whom according to the guides are but few Frenchmen) turn their steps toward this field which witnessed the overthrow of the greatest military genius of his generation, if not of all time.

The scene of carnage is now marked by an enormous artificial mound 130 feet in height and surmounted by an immense stone lion—the Lion of Waterloo. The animal looks toward the point from which Napoleon made his last charge and seems to be watching lest the attack may be renewed. Wellington upon visiting

the battlefield after the erection of this mound, is said to have complained that they had ruined the battlefield to secure dirt for this stupedous pile; and it is true that the surface of the earth in that vicinity has been very much altered. In leveling the knolls they have destroyed one of the most interesting land-marks of the battlefield—the sunken road in which so many of the French soldiers lost their lives. As the guide tells it, Napoleon asked a Belgian peasant if there was any ravine to be crossed between him and the enemy's lines, and the peasant replied in the negative; but when the French rushed over this knoll, they came suddenly and unexpectedly upon a narrow road in a cut about twenty feet deep, and, falling in, filled up the cut until succeeding ranks crossed over on their dead bodies.

The field as a whole might be described as a rolling prairie although the visitor is told of groves no longer standing. At the Hugomond farm, the walls of the house bear evidence of the conflict that raged nearly a century ago, and one is shown the ruins of an old well in which, it is said, the bodies of 300 English soldiers were buried. This portion of the battlefield reminds one somewhat of that portion of the battlefield of Gettysburg which was made famous by Pickett's charge, although there are but few monuments at Waterloo to mark the places occupied by the various brigades and divisions.

At a restaurant near the mound one is shown the chair in which, according to tradition, Wellington sat when he was laying his plans for the last day's bat-

tle, and you can, for a franc each, secure bullets warranted to have been found upon the field. It is rumored, however, that some of the bullets now found are of modern make and that thrifty peasants sow them as they do grain, and gather them for the benefit of tourists.

I found Europe agitated by a remark recently made by the emperor of Germany which gave the Prussian troops credit for saving the English and winning the day, but the French are as quick to dispute this claim as the English. The comedians have taken the matter up in the British Isles and, at one London theatre, an actor dressed as an Englishman, is made to meet a German and, after an exchange of compliments, the Englishman brings down the house by saying: "I beg pardon! It may be a little late, but let me thank you for saving us at Waterloo."

It is hardly worth while for the allies to quarrel over the division of credit. There was glory enough for all--and it required the co-operation of all to overcome the genius and the strategy of Bonaparte.

THE NETHERLANDS.

Between Waterloo, one of the world's most renowned battle-fields, and The Hague, which is to be the home of the Temple of Peace—what a contrast; and yet Belgium and The Netherlands lie side by side! Perhaps the contrast is chronological rather than geographical or racial, for the Dutch have had their share of fighting on their own soil, as they had their part in the victory of 1815. It seems especially appropriate that The Hague should be chosen as the permanent meeting place of the peace tribunal, for it is not only centrally located for European countries, and, being small, is not itself tempted to appeal to arms, but it has long been the home of religious liberty, and its people were pioneers in the defense of the doctrine that rulers exist for the people, not the people for the rulers.

The capital of The Netherlands—The Hague—(the name is taken from the forest that adjoins) is a beautiful little city and will furnish an appropriate setting for the building which Mr. Carnegie's generosity is to provide. Plans are already being prepared for this structure, and one of the officials showed me a picture representing Peace which may be reproduced upon the ceiling or walls.

In the gallery at Moscow I saw a painting by the great Russian artist, Verechiagin. It is a pyramid of

whitened skulls standing out against a dark background, and is dedicated to "The Warriors of the World." It tells the whole story of war in so solemn, impressive, and terrible a way that Von Moltke is said to have issued an order prohibiting German officers from looking at it when it was exhibited at Berlin.

The emperor of Russia, who has the distinction and the honor of having called together the conference which resulted in The Hague tribunal, might with great propriety contribute to the Temple of Peace this masterpiece of one of his countrymen, portraying so vividly the evils which arbitration is intended to remedy.

One of the members of the arbitration court told me that it was both interesting and instructive to note how the nations appearing before that court emphasized, not so much their pecuniary claims, as the honor of their respective nations and the justice of their acts.

No one can foresee or foretell how great an influence The Hague tribunal will have upon the world's affairs, but it would seem difficult to exaggerate it. It is cultivating a public opinion which will in time coerce the nations into substituting arbitration for violence in the settlement of international disputes; and it ought to be a matter of gratification to every American that our country is taking so active a part in the forwarding of the movement.

But The Hague is not the only place of interest in The Netherlands. The land replevined from the sea by the sturdy Dutch and protected by dykes, the

spot immortalized by the temporary sojourn of the Pilgrims, the familiar blue china, the huge wind mills with their deliberate movements, the wooden shoes, and the numerous waterways—all these attract the attention of the tourist.

And the commercial metropolis of Holland, Amsterdam--what a quaint old city it is! Its more than 300 canals roaming their way through the city, and its hundreds of bridges, have given to it the name of "The Northern Venice," and it well deserves the appellation. The houses are built on piles, and as many of them are settling, they lean in every direction, some out toward the street, some back, and some toward the side. The houses are so dependent upon each other for their support that it is a common saying in that city that if you want to injure your neighbor, you have only to pull down your own house.

Amsterdam is the center of the diamond cutting industry of the world, more than 10,000 hands being employed in that work. As is well known, the Dutch are a rich people, and their commerce, like their mortgages, can be found everywhere.

They have a constitutional monarchy, but they have universal education and parliamentary government, and are jealous of their political rights.

Denmark, Belgium and The Netherlands--three little kingdoms! Small in area, but brimful of people, and these people have their part in the solving of problems with which Europe is now grappling.

GERMANY AND SOCIALISM.

At Berlin I found, as I had at London and Paris, a considerable number of Americans and, as in the other cities, they have organized a society, the object of which is to bring the American residents together for friendly intercourse. At London the group is known as the American Society; at Paris and Berlin the society is known as the American Chamber of Commerce. Through the receptions given by these societies I was able to meet not only the leading American residents, but many foreigners who came as invited guests. Our American residents are evidently conducting themselves well because I found that they are well liked by the people among whom they are temporarily sojourning. I am indebted to Ambassador Tower and to the American Chamber of Commerce for courtesies extended me at Berlin.

My visit to Germany occurred at Christmas time and while it was for that reason impossible to see the kaiser (much to my regret), I learned something of the German method of observing the great Christian holiday. The German is essentially a domestic man and at Christmas time especially gives himself up to the society of the family, relatives and friends. Christmas coming on Friday, the festivities covered three days, Friday, Saturday and Sunday. The toys—in which Germany abounds—were of endless variety, and the Christmas trees bending beneath their

load were centers of interest to the young folks. There were dolls and dogs, horses and woolley sheep, cows that give milk, and soldiers—an abundance of soldiers. I saw one cavalryman with a saber in his hand. When he was wound up the horse would rush forward and the rider would strike out with his saber as if he was keeping watch on the Rhine and in the very act of resisting an attack from the enemy. A little strange that the birthday of the Prince of Peace should be celebrated by the presentation of toys illustrating mimic warfare! But as in America we are increasing our army and enlarging our navy we are not in a very good position to take the military mote out of the eye of our friends in the fatherland.

Berlin is a splendid city with beautiful streets, parks and public buildings. It is more modern in appearance than either London or Paris and there is a solidity and substantialness about the population that explains the character of the emigration from Germany to America. No one can look upon a gathering of average Germans without recognizing that he is in the presence of a strong, intelligent and masterful people. Bismarck has left his impress upon Germany as Napoleon did upon France. An heroic statue of the man of "blood and iron" stands between the reichstag and the column of Victory, which was erected at the close of the Franco-Prussian war. The reichstag is a massive, but graceful structure, built some twenty years ago. In one of the corridors I noticed a silk flag which was presented in the seventies by the German women of America. The reichstag

proper is a popular body, much like the English parliament, and, as in England, the members do not necessarily reside in the districts they represent. The upper house, or bundesrath, is somewhat like our senate in one respect, namely, that it represents the various states that comprise the German empire, but it differs from our senate, first, in that the subdivisions are represented somewhat in proportion to population, and, second, in that the members of the bundesrath are really ambassadors of the several state governments whose credentials can be withdrawn at any time. As all legislation must be concurred in by the bundesrath as well as by the reichstag it will be seen that the German government is not nearly so responsive to the will of the people as the governments of England, Denmark and the Netherlands.

In the reichstag they have resorted to a device for saving time in roll call. Each member is supplied with a quantity of tickets, some pink and some white. Each ticket bears on both sides the name of the member. On the white tickets the word "Ja" (yes) appears under the name, on the pink ones "Nein" (no). These ballots are gathered up in vases containing two receptacles, one white and the other pink. The vases are carried through the hall and the votes deposited according to color. As they are deposited in the different receptacles and are distinguished by color the ballot is quickly taken and counted—in about one-fourth the time, I think, formerly required for roll call. This is a method which our congress might find it convenient to adopt.

It was my good fortune, while in Berlin, to meet Dr. Otto Arendt, the leading bimetallist of Germany. He became a student of the money question while in college, being converted to the double standard by the writings of Cernucshi, the great French economist. Dr. Arendt is a member of the reichstag, from one of the agricultural constituencies. He has represented his government in international conferences and has urged his government to join in an agreement to restore bimetallism, but like other advocates of the double standard has found the English financiers an immovable obstruction in the way.

I have for two reasons reserved for this article some comments on the growth of socialism in Europe. First, because Germany was to be the last of the larger countries visited, and, second, because socialism seems to be growing more rapidly in Germany than anywhere else. I find that nearly all of the European nations have carried collective ownership farther than we have in the United States. In a former article reference has already been made to the growth of municipal ownership in England and Scotland, and I may add that where the private ownership of public utilities is still permitted the regulation of the corporations holding these franchises is generally more strict than in the United States. Let two illustrations suffice: Where parliament charters gas and water companies in cities it has for some years been the practice to limit the dividends that can be earned—any surplus earnings over and above the dividends allowed must be used in reducing the price paid by the consumer. I

fear that our money magnates would be at a loss to find words to express their indignation if any such restriction was suggested in America, and yet is it not a just and reasonable restriction?

In the case of railroads, I noticed that there are in England but few grade (or, as they call them, "level") crossings. I am informed that railroad accidents and injuries are not so frequent in England as in the United States.

In Switzerland the government has recently acquired the principal railroad systems. In Holland, Belgium and Denmark also the railroads are largely government roads. In Russia the government owns and operates the roads and I found there a new form of collectivism, namely, the employment of a community physician who treats the people without charge. These physicians are employed by societies called Zemstro which have control of the roads and the care of the sick.

In Germany, however, socialism as an economic theory is being urged by a strong and growing party. In the last general election the socialists polled a little more than three million votes out of a total of about nine and a half millions. Measured by the popular vote it is now the strongest party in Germany. The fact that with thirty-one per cent of the vote it only has eighty-one members of the reichstag out of a total of 397 is due, in part, to the fact that the socialist vote is massed in the cities and in part to the fact that the population has increased more rapidly in the

cities and as there has been no recent redistricting the socialist city districts are larger than the districts returning members of other parties.

George von Vollmar, a member of the reichstag, in a recent issue of the National Review thus states the general purpose of the social democratic party in Germany:

"It is well known that social democracy in all countries, as its name indicates, aims in the first place at social and economic reform. It starts from the point of view that economic development, the substitution of machinery for hand implements, and the supplanting of small factories by gigantic industrial combinations, deprive the worker in an ever-increasing degree of the essential means of production, thereby converting him into a possessionless proletarian, and that the means of production are becoming the exclusive possession of a comparatively small number of capitalists, who constantly monopolize all the advantages which the gigantic increase in the productive capacity of human effort has brought about. Thus, according to the social democrats, capital is master of all the springs of life, and lays a yoke on the working classes in particular, and the whole population in general, which ever becomes more and more unbearable. The masses, as their insight into the general trend of affairs develops, become daily more and more conscious of the contrast between the exploiter and the exploited, and in all countries with an industrial development society is divided into two hostile camps, which wage war on each other with ever increasing bitterness.

"To this class-war is due the origin and continuous development of social democracy, the chief task of which is to unite these factions in an harmonious whole which they will direct to its true goal. Industrial combination on a large scale can be converted from a source of misery and oppression into a source of the greatest prosperity and of harmonious perfection when the means of production cease to be the exclusive appanage of capital and are transferred to the hands of society at large. The social revolution here indicated implies the liberation not only of the proletariat, but of mankind as a whole, which suffers from the decomposing influence of existing class antagonism whereby all social progress is crippled."

One of the most influential of the German socialists in answer to a series of questions submitted by me said in substance:

First, the general aim of socialists in Germany is the same as the aim of other socialists throughout the world—namely, the establishment of a collective commonwealth based on democratic equality.

Second, the socialists of Germany have organized a liberal party of unrivalled strength; they have educated the working classes to a very high standard of political intelligence and to a strong sense of their independence and of their social mission, as the living and progressive force in every social respect; they have promoted the organization of trade unions; and have by their incessant agitation compelled the other parties and the government to take up social and labor legislation.

Third, German socialists at present are contending for a legal eight-hour day and for the creation of a labor department in the government, with labor officers and labor chambers throughout the country. In addition to these special reforms socialists are urging various constitutional and democratic reforms in the states and municipalities--in the latter housing reforms, direct employment of labor, etc.

Fourth, there may be some difference of opinion among socialists in regard to the competitive system, but being scientific evolutionists they all agree that competition was at one time a great step in advance and acted for generations as a social lever of industrial progress, but they believe that it has many evil consequences and that it is now being outgrown by capitalistic concerns, whose power to oppress has become a real danger to the community. They contend that there is not much competition left with these monopolies and that, as on the other hand, education and the sense of civic responsibility are visibly growing, and will grow more rapidly when socialism gets hold of the public mind, socialists think that the time is approaching when all monopolies must and can safely be taken over by the state or municipality as the case may be. This would not destroy all competition at once--in industries not centralized some competition might continue to exist. In this respect also all socialists are evolutionists, however they may differ as to ways and means and political methods.

Fifth, as to the line between what are called natural monopolies and ordinary industries, the question

is partly answered by the preceeding paragraph. There is a general consensus of opinion that natural monopolies should, in any case, be owned by the community.

I find that even in Germany there are degrees among socialists--some like Babel and Singer emphasizing the ultimate ends of socialism, while others led by Bernstein are what might be called progressionists or opportunists—that is, they are willing to take the best they can get today and from that vantage ground press on to something better. It is certain that the socialists of Germany are securing reforms, but so far they are reforms which have either already been secured in other countries or are advocated elsewhere by other parties as well as by the socialist party.

The whole question of socialism hangs upon the question: Is competition an evil or a good? If it is an evil then monopolies are right and we have only to decide whether the monopolies should be owned by the state or by private individuals. If, on the other hand, competition is a good then it should be restored where it can be restored. In the case of natural monopolies where it is impossible for competition to exist, the government would administer the monopolies not on the ground that competition is undesirable, but on the ground that in such cases it is impossible.

Those who believe that the right is sure of ultimate triumph will watch the struggle in Germany and profit by the lessons taught. I am inclined to believe that political considerations are so mingled with economic theories that it is difficult as yet to know just what proportion of the three million socialist vot-

ers believe in "the government ownership and operation of all the means of production and distribution." The old age pension act was given as a sop to the socialists, but it strengthened rather than weakened their contentions and their party. It remains to be seen whether the new concessions which they seem likely to secure will still further augment their strength. The Germans are a studious and a thoughtful people and just now they are absorbed in the consideration of the aims and methods of the socialist movement (mingled with a greater or less amount of governmental reform), and the world awaits their verdict with deep interest.

Russia and Her Czar.

The map of Russia makes the other nations of Europe look insignificant by comparison. Moscow is called "The Heart of Russia," and yet the trans-Siberian railway from Moscow to Vladivostok is about 6,000 miles long, nearly one-fourth the circumference of the globe. From St. Petersburg to Sebastopol is more than 2,000 miles, and yet Russia's territory extends much further north than St. Petersburg and much further south than Sebastopol. In a book recently issued by authority of the Russian government some comparisons are made that give an idea of the immensity of Russia's domain. For instance, Siberia is about one and one-half times as large as Europe, 25 times as large as Germany, and covers one-thirteenth of the continental surface of the globe. Besides having great timber belts and vast prairies, Siberia has a hill and lake region ten times as large as Switzerland, and it is claimed that some of the lakes are as beautiful as those of "The Mountain Republic." Lately the government has been encouraging immigration into the country opened up by the trans-Siberian railway and the success of the movement is shown by the fact that the number of passengers carried on the western section of the road increased from 160,000 in 1896 to 379,000 in 1898, and on the middle section from 177,000 in 1897 to 476,000 in 1898, with a similar increase in freight traffic. The

government gives a certain area of land to each settler and when necessary advances sufficient money to build homes and barns for the storage of crops and for the purchase of agricultural implements. The territorial greatness of Russia is the first thing that impresses the tourist, and the second is that it is as yet so sparsely settled that it can without fear of crowding accommodate a vast increase in population.

Russia embraces all varieties of climate and resources.

My journey was confined to the northeast portion. I entered the country below Warsaw, went west to Moscow, then north to St. Petersburg and thence southeast to Berlin. This, with the exception of my visit to Tula, gave me my only opportunity to see the people of Russia. They impressed me as being a hardy race and the necessities of climate are such as to compel industry and activity. I never saw elsewhere such universal preparation for cold weather. As yet Russia is almost entirely agricultural, but manufacturing enterprises are continually increasing. The peasants live in villages and for the most part hold their lands in common—that is, the lands belong to the commune or village as a whole and not to the individual. When Alexander freed the serfs the land was sold to them jointly on long-time payments. These payments have in only a few instances been completed, wherefore not many of the peasants own land individually. There is just now much discussion in Russia about the method of holding land. Some contend

that communal holding tends to discourage thrift and enterprise, and there is some agitation in favor of individual ownership.

Moscow, the largest city of Russia, has a trifle larger population than St. Petersburg, the capital, which has more than a million. Moscow, which is the commercial center of the empire, gives the casual visitor a much better idea of the characteristic life and architecture of Russia than does St. Petersburg. St. Petersburg, however, is laid out upon a broader, more generous plan, has wider streets, more impressive public buildings and private residences, and there is more evidence of wealth in the capital than in the commercial center. Both cities possess admirable museums and art galleries. The chief gallery of Moscow devotes nearly all its wall space to pictures by Russian artists, and they are sufficient in number to prove Russia's claim to an honorable place in the world of art.

The Hermitage at St. Petersburg, which is an annex of the emperor's palace, contains an extraordinary number of masterpieces of modern and ancient art. The museum of the academy of sciences possesses a remarkable collection of fine specimens of prehistoric animals, among them mammoths, the largest and best preserved of which was found only a few years ago at the foot of a Siberian glacier.

The visitor to Russia comes away with conflicting emotions. He is impressed by the wonderful possibilities of the country, but is oppressed by the limitations and restrictions which the government

places upon individual action and activity. As soon as the traveler reaches the border of Russia his passport is demanded. It is again demanded the moment he arrives at his hotel, and it is demanded and inspected at every place he stops. When he is about to leave the country he must send his passport to the police office and have it indorsed with official permission to depart. Not only is a passport demanded at every place from the foreigner, but native Russians, high and low, must also bear passports and be prepared to submit them for inspection upon demand. Not even officers of the army are exempt from this rigid rule.

The censorship over the press and over private mail is very strict. I brought away with me a copy of Stead's Review of Reviews which had been posted to a subscriber in Russia and which had passed through the hands of the censor. Its pages bore abundant evidence of the care with which he scrutinized foreign publications, for objectionable cartoons, articles and even paragraphs had been made illegible by an obliterating stamp.

The government of Russia, as the world knows, is an autocracy. All power is vested in the emperor, and all authority emanates from him. Being an autocracy, Russia has, of course, no legislative body, such as is now a part of the government of nearly every civilized country on the globe. It has not trial by jury and it knows not the writ of habeas corpus. The custom of exiling or banishing without trial persons obectionable to the government is still practiced. A

large number of Finns, many of them persons of prominence, have been deported from Finnland since the decree of 1899, which limited the self-governmnet which the Finns had enjoyed since Russia annexed their country.

While in St. Petersburg I was, by the courtesy of the American ambassador, Mr. McCormick, given an opportunity of meeting and chatting with the czar of all the Russias, Emperor Nicholas II. I found him at his winter residence, the palace of Tzarskoje Selo, which is about an hour's ride from St. Petersburg.

Of all the emperor's palaces, Tzarskoje Selo is his favorite. It stands in a magnificent park which at this time of year is covered with snow. The emperor is a young man, having been born in 1868. He is not more than five feet seven or eight inches in height and apparently weighs about 160 pounds. His figure is slender and erect, his face boyish and his eyes a light blue. His hair, which is blonde, is cut rather short and combed upward over the forehead. The czar wears a mustache and short beard. The general expression of his face is gentle rather than severe and he speaks English perfectly. He informed me that about 65 per cent of the adult men of Russia can read and write and that the number is increasing at the rate of about 3 per cent a year. This increase, the czar said, was shown by the recruits to the army, and as these come from all provinces of the empire and all classes of society, he believes it to be a fair test of the people as a whole. The czar declared himself deeply interested in the spread of education among

the people and seemed to realize that opportunities for education should be extended to men and women equally. I referred to a decree issued by him about a year ago promising a measure of self-government to the local communities. The czar said: "Yes, that was issued last February, and the plan is now being worked out." He manifested great gratification at the outcome of the proposals submitted by him which resulted in the establishment of The Hague court of arbitration and it is a movement of which he may justly feel proud, for while it is not probable that The Hague tribunal will at once end all wars, it is certain to contribute largely to the growth of a sentiment that will substitute the reign of reason for the rule of brute force. The czar spoke warmly of the friendly relations that had existed for years between Russia and the United States. He said that the people of his country had rejoiced in the growth and greatness of the United States. Then, speaking with considerable feeling, the czar said: "The attitude of Russia in the Kischineff affair has been very much misrepresented by some of the newspapers and I wish you would tell your people so when you return to the United States."

The Russian officials deny that the government was in any way responsible for the massacre and I was informed that the government had caused the prosecution and secured the imprisonment of many of those implicated. The emperor showed in his conversation that he respected public opinion in the United States and was anxious that his administration should not rest under condemnation. It seems to be

the general opinion of those with whom I had a chance to speak in Russia that the emperor himself is much more progressive and liberal than his official environment. If he were free to act upon his own judgment, it is believed that he would go further and faster than the officeholding class surrounding him in broadening the foundations of government, and from his words and manner during my conversation with him I am inclined to share this opinion.

What Russia most needs today are free speech and a free press—free speech that those who have the welfare of the country at heart may give expression to their views and contribute their wisdom to that public opinion which in all free countries controls to a greater or less extent those who hold office. To deny freedom of speech is to question the ability of truth to combat error; it is to doubt the power of right to vindicate itself. A free press would not only enable those in office to see their actions as others see them, but would exercise a wholesome restraint. Publicity will often deter an official from wrong-doing when other restraints would be insufficient, and those who are anxious to do well ought to welcome anything that would throw light upon their path. With free speech and a free press it would not be long before the participation of the Russian people in government would be enlarged, and with that enlarged share in the control of their own affairs would come not only contentment, but the education which responsibility and self-government bring. It is impossible to prepare people for self-

government by depriving them of the exercise of political rights. As children learn to walk by being allowed to fall and rise and fall and rise again, so people profit by experience and learn from the consequences of their mistakes.

That the Russian people are devoted to their church is evident everywhere. Every village and town has its churches, and the cities have cathedrals, chapels and shrines seemingly innumerable. St. Isaac's cathedral in St. Petersburg is an immense basilica and is ornamented in nave and transcept with precious and semi-precious stones. The superb portico is supported by a maze of granite monoliths seven feet in diameter. There is now in process of construction at Moscow a still more elaborate cathedral. Russia is not a good missionary field for two reasons: First, because the people seem wedded to their church, and, second, because no one is permitted to sever his connection with the church.

The child of an orthodox Russian becomes a member of the church of his parents and if he desires to enter another church he must leave the country. If one of the orthodox church marries a member of another church the children must of necessity be reared in the Russian faith. It will be seen, therefore, that the church is very closely connected with the government itself, and quite as arbitrary.

De Tocqueville some fifty years ago predicted a large place for Russia among the nations of Europe and my visit to the great empire of the northeast convinced me that Russia with universal education, free-

Pope Pius X

Count Tolstoy

Emperor Nicholas II

dom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of religion and constitutional self-government would exert an influence upon the destinies of the old world to which it would be difficult to set a limit.

Rome—The Catholic Capital.

The dominant feature of Rome is the religious feature, and it is fitting that it should be so, for here the soil was stained with the blood of those who first harkened to the voice of the Nazarene--here a cruel Nero lighted his garden with human torches, little thinking that the religion of those whom he burned would in time illumine the earth.

The fact that the city is the capital of the Catholic world is apparent everywhere. All interest is centered in the vatican and St. Peter's. The civil government of Italy extends to the nation's borders, but the papal authority of Rome reaches to the remotest corners of the earth. I was anxious to see the man upon whom such vast responsibility rests, and whose words so profoundly influence millions of the human race. Lord Denbigh, of England, had given me a letter of introduction to Cardinal Merry del Val, the papal secretary of state, and armed with this I visited the vatican. Cardinal del Val is an exceedingly interesting man. He was born of Spanish parents, but one of his grand-parents was English, and he is connected by ties of blood with several families of the English nobility. He was educated in England, and speaks that language fluently and without an accent, as he does French, German, Italian and Spanish. His linguistic accomplishments are almost as great as those of the famous Cardinal Mezzofanti.

Cardinal del Val is an unusually young man to occupy such an important post—he is not yet forty. He impresses one as a man of rare ability and he possesses extraordinary versatility and a diplomatic training that will make him eminently useful to His Holiness. The papal secretary of state is a tall, slender, distinguished-looking man. His intellectual face is thin and oval; his eyes are large, dark and brilliant, showing his Spanish birth. He received us in his private apartments in the vatican. They are among the most interesting of the 1,200 rooms in that great building and were once occupied by that famous pope who was a Borgia. The ceilings and walls down to the floor are painted magnificently, the decoration having been done by the hand of a master artist of Borgia's reign. For centuries the suit now occupied by Cardinal del Val had been part of the vatican library. The beautiful walls were once hidden by a coat of rude whitewash, but the paintings were discovered not long ago and the pictures restored once more to view.

Before visiting the vatican I called upon Monsignor Kennedy, the rector of the American college. Mgr. Kennedy is a learned and an exceedingly agreeable American and under his efficient management the number of students in the college has been doubled within a few years. He enabled me to meet Pope Pius' Maestro di Camera. By the good offices of Cardinal del Val, and the Maestro di Camera it was arranged that I should have a private audience with the Holy Father the following day, Mgr. Kennedy acting as interpreter.

Pope Pius received us in his private audience room adjoining the public audience chamber, where distinguished Catholics from all over the world were collected and ready to be presented and receive the papal blessing. The private audience room is a rather small apartment, simply, but beautifully furnished and decorated. A throne bearing the papal crown occupied one side of the room. His Holiness greeted us very courteously and cordially. He wore a long white cassock, with a girdle at the waist; the fisherman's ring was on his finger and he wore a small, closely fitting skull-cap of white. I had an opportunity to study his face. It is a round, strong face, full of kindliness and benevolence, but there are not lacking indications that its possessor has a purpose and will of his own. The face is ruddy and the nose rather long—it is straight and not arched. His eyes are large, blue and friendly. The scant hair visible below the skull-cap is white. In stature the Holy Father is about five feet nine or ten inches and his figure is sturdy, but not too heavy. His step is light and gives an impression of strength and good health.

His Holiness has already gained a reputation as a democratic pontiff and enjoys a large and growing popularity with the people. He is an orator and often on Sunday goes into one of the many court yards of the vatican and preaches to the crowds that gather quite informally. His gestures are said to be graceful and his voice melodious. His manner is earnest and his thoughts are expressed in a clear and emphatic language. There is a feeling in Rome that Pius X. is

going to be known in history as a reformer—not as a reformer of doctrine, but as one who will popularize the church's doctrine with a view to increasing the heartiness and zeal of the masses in the application of religious truth to everyday life.

I assured his Holiness that I appreciated the opportunity that was his to give impetus to the moral forces of the world, and he replied: "I hope my efforts in that direction will be such as to merit commendation." Answering my statement that I called to present the good will of many Catholic friends as well as to pay my respects, His Holiness asked me to carry his benediction back to them.

If I may venture an opinion upon such brief observation, it is that heart characteristics will dominate the present pontiff's course. He is not so renowned a scholar and diplomat as was his predecessor, nor is he so skilled in statecraft, but he is a virile, energetic, pratical religious teacher, charitable, abounding in good works and full of brotherly love. I am confident that he will play an important part in the world-wide conflict between man and mammon.

The world has made and is making great progress in education and in industry. The percentage of illiteracy is everywhere steadily decreasing.The standards of art and taste are rising and the forces of nature are being harnessed to do the work of man. Steam, madly escaping from its prison walls, turns myrid wheels and drags our commerce over land and sea, while electricity, more fleet of foot than Mercury, has become the message-bearer of millions. Even the waves

of the air are now obedient to the command of man and intelligence is flashed across the ocean without the aid of wires. With this dominion over nature man has been able to advance his physical well-being as well as to enlarge his mental horizon, but has the moral development of the people kept pace with material prosperity? The growing antagonism between capital and labor, the lack of sympathy often manifest between those of the same race and even of the same religion when enjoying incomes quite unequal—these things would seem to indicate that the heart has lagged behind the head and the purse. The restoration of the equilibrium and the infusing of a feeling of brotherhood that will establish justice and good will must be the aim of those who are sincerely interested in the progress of the race. This is preeminently the work of our religious teachers, although it is a work in which the laity as well as the clergy must take part.

After meeting Pius X., late the beloved patriarch of Venice, I feel assured that he is peculiarly fitted to lead his portion of the Christian church in this great endeavor.

The vatican which serves as the home and executive offices of the supreme pontiff of the Catholic church is an enormous building, or rather collection of buildings for it bears evidence of additions and annexes. One might be easily lost in its maze of corridors. The ceilings of the chief apartments are high and, like the walls of the spacious rooms and halls, are covered with frescoes of priceless value. The vat-

ican adjoins St. Peter's cathedral or basilica as it is called—a description of whose beauties would fill a volume. The basilica is so harmoniously proportioned that one does not appreciate its vastness from a distance, but once within its walls it is easy to credit the statement that fifty thousand persons can be crowded into it. In a crypt just beneath the great dome is the tomb of St. Peter about which myriad lamps are kept constantly burning. Near the tomb is a crucifix suspended under a canopy supported by four spiral columns that are replicas of a column elsewhere in the cathedral that is said to have been part of Solomon's temple. Not far from the crucifix is the famous bronze statue of St. Peter, made from a pagan statue of Jupiter. It is mounted upon a pedestal about five feet high and the large toe of the right foot, which projects over the pedestal, has been worn smooth by the lips of devout visitors to the basilica.

To me the most remarkable of the splendors of the cathedral were the Mosaic pictures of which there are many of heroic size. These Mosaics depict Bible scenes and characters and are done with such marvellous skill that a little way off one can hardly doubt that they are the product of the brush of some great master. The colors, tints and shades are so perfect that it is difficult to believe that the pictures are formed by the piecing together of tiny bits of colored marbles and other stones. The vatican maintains a staff of artists in Mosaic, some of whose work may be purchased by the public. I was shown the masterpiece of Michael Angelo in the cathedral of St. Peter

in Vinculo—a statue of Moses, seated. In the right knee there is a slight crack visible and it is the tradition that when the great sculptor had finished his work he struck the knee with his mallet in a burst of enthusiasm and exclaimed, "Now, speak." St. Paul's cathedral, which stands outside the ancient wall of the city, is of modern construction and is therefore less interesting to the visitor than the great basilica of St. Peter's.

Next to the vatican and the cathedrals in interest are the ruins of ancient Rome. In England and France I had seen buildings many centuries old; in Rome one walks at the foot of walls that for nearly two thousand years have defied the ravages of time. The best preserved and most stupendous of the relics of "The Eternal City" is the Colosseum. It is built upon a scale that gives some idea of the largeness of Roman conceptions and of the prodigality with which the emperors expended the money and labor of the people. The arena in which the gladiators fought with their fellows and with wild beasts—the arena in which many of the Christian martyrs met their death—is slightly oval in form, the longest diameter being about 250 feet. The arena was so arranged that it could be flooded with water and used for aquatic tournaments. The spectators looked down upon the contests from galleries that rose in four tiers to a height of 150 feet. At one end of the arena was the tribune occupied by the emperor and his suite; at the other end the vestal virgins occupied another tribune and it was their privilege to confer either life or death upon the vanquished

gladiators by turning the thumb up or down—turned up it meant life, turned down, death. The Roman populace gained access to the galleries by 160 doors and stairways. The seating capacity of the Colosseum is estimated to have been fifty thousand.

The Forum is even richer than the Colosseum in historic interest and recent excavations have brought to light what are supposed to be the tomb of Caesar and the tomb of Romulus. The tribune is pointed out from which the Roman orators addressed the multitude. Here Cicero hurled his invectives at Cataline and Mark Anthony is by Shakespeare made to plead here for fallen Caesar. The triumphal arch of Constantine stands at one end of the Forum and is in an excellent state of preservation. Among the carvings lately exhumed are some (especially atractive to an agriculturist) showing the forms of the bull, the sheep and the hog. They are so like the best breeds of these animals today that one can scarcely believe they were chiseled from stone nearly twenty centuries ago. In Rome, as in Paris, there is a Pantheon in the familiar style of Greek architecture. In the Roman Pantheon is the tomb of Raphael. Cardinal Bembo in recognition of Raphael's genius, caused to be placed upon his tomb a Latin epitaph which Hope has translated:

"Living, great nature feared he might outvie
Her works, and dying fears herself to die."

To those who are familiar with Roman history the river Tiber is an object of interest, but here, as is often the case, one feels disappointed in finding that the thing pictured was larger than the reality. The Tiber,

yellow as the Missouri, flows through the very heart of Rome and is kept within its channel by a high stone embankment. In and near Rome are many ancient palaces, some of them falling into decay, and some well preserved. One of the most modern of the palaces of the Italian nobles was built by American money, the wife being a member of a wealthy New York family. Part of this palace is now occupied by the American ambassador, Mr. Myer, to whom I am indebted for courtesies extended in Rome. Art galleries and museums are numerous in Rome and in the other cities of Italy, and contain many of the works of the great Italian artists like Raphael Angelo, Titian and others. The palace of King Victor Emmanuel and the public buildings of Rome are imposing, but do not compare in size or magnificence with the ancient palaces of England and France. The journey from Rome to Venice carried us through a very fertile part of Italy. The land is carefully cultivated; the thrifty farmers in some places have set out mulberry trees for the cultivation of the silk worm and have trained grape vines upon the trees.

We passed through the edge of Venice and saw the gondoliers on the Grand Canal waiting to carry passengers into the city. A very intelligent Italian newspaper correspondent whom I met in Rome informed me that the northern provinces of Italy were much further advanced in education than the southern provinces, but that the people of the south were mentally very alert and with the addition of instruction would soon reach the intellectual level of the north.

My stay in Italy was all too brief and I left with much reluctance this nursery of early civilization—this seat of government of the world's greatest religious organization.

Tolstoy the Apostle of Love.

Count Leo Tolstoy, the intellectual giant of Russia, the moral Titan of Europe and the world's most conspicuous exponent of the doctrine of love, is living a life of quiet retirement upon his estate near the village of Yasnaya, Poliana, about one hundred and thirty miles south of Moscow.

I made a visit to the home of this peasant philosopher during my stay in Russia, driving from Tula in the early morning and arriving just after daylight. Consul General Smith of Moscow arranged with Count Tolstoy for the visit. I had intended remaining only a few hours, but his welcome was so cordial that my stay was prolonged until near midnight. Count Tolstoy is now about seventy-six years old, and while he shows the advance of years he is still full of mental vigor and retains much of his physical strength. As an illustration of the latter, I might refer to the horseback ride and walk which we took together in the afternoon. The ride covered about four miles and the walk about two. When we reached the house the count said that he would take a little rest and insisted that I should do likewise. A few minutes later when I expressed to the count's physician, Dr. Burkenheim, the fear that he might have overtaxed his strength, the doctor smilingly assured me that the count usually took more exercise, but had

purposely lessened his allowance that day, fearing that he might fatigue me.

Count Tolstoy is an impressive figure. His years have only slightly bowed his broad shoulders and his step is still alert. In height he is about five feet eight, his head is large and his abundant hair is not yet wholly white. His large blue eyes are set wide apart and are shaded by heavy eyebrows. The forehead is unusually wide and high. He wears a long, full beard that gives him a patriarchal appearance. The mouth is large and the lips full. The nose is rather long and the nostrils wide. The hands are muscular, and the grasp bespeaks warmth of heart. The count dresses like the peasants of his country, wearing a grayish-blue blouse belted in at the waist, with skirts reaching nearly to the boot-tops. His trousers, also of the peasant style, are inclined to be baggy and are stuffed into his boots. I was informed that the count never wears any other dress even when other members of the family are entertaining guests in evening clothes.

The room which I occupied was the one used by the count as a study in his younger days, and I was shown a ring in the ceiling from which at the age of forty-eight he planned to hang himself--a plan from which he was turned by the resolve to change the manner and purpose of his life. As is well known, Count Tolstoy is a member of the Russian nobility and for nearly fifty years led the life of a nobleman. He early achieved fame as a novelist, his "War and Peace," which was written when he was but a young

man, being considered one of the literary master pieces of the century. He sounded all the "depths and shoals of honor" in the literary and social world he realized all that one could wish or expect in these lines, but found that success did not satisfy the cravings of the inner man. While he was meditating upon what he had come to regard as a wasted life, a change came over him, and with a faith that has never faltered he turned about and entered upon a career that has been unique in history. He donned the simple garb of a peasant, and, living frugally, has devoted himself to philosophy and unremunerative work --that is, unremunerative from a financial standpoint, although he declares that it has brought him more genuine enjoyment than he ever knew before. All of his books written since this change in his life have been given to the public without copyright except in one instance when the proceeds of "Resurrection" were pledged to the aid of the Russian Quakers, called Doukhobors, whom the count assisted to emigrate from their persecution in Russia to western Canada, where they now reside. As an evidence of the count's complete renunciation of all money considerations, it is stated that he has declined an offer of $500,000 for the copyright of the books written by him before his life current was altered.

My object in visiting him was not so much to learn his views--for his opinions have had wide expression and can be found in his numerous essays--but it was rather to see the man and ascertain if I could from personal contact the secret of the tremendous influence

that he is exerting upon the thought of the world. I am satisfied that, notwithstanding his great intellect, his colossal strength lies in his heart more than in his mind. It is true that few have equalled him in power of analysis and in clearness of statement, while none have surpassed him in beauty and aptness of illustration. But no one can commune with him without feeling that the man is like an overflowing spring--asking nothing, but giving always. He preaches self-abnegation and has demonstrated to his own satisfaction that there is more genuine joy in living for others than in living upon others--more happiness in serving than in being served.

The purpose of life, as defined by him, has recently been quoted by Mr. Ernest Crosby in "The Open Court." It reads as follows:

"Life then is the activity of the animal individuality working in submission to the law of reason. Reason shows man that happiness cannot be obtained by a self-life and leaves only one outlet open for him and that is love. Love is the only legitimate manifestation of life. It is an activity that has for its object the good of others. When it makes its appearance the meaningless strife of the animal life ceases."

Love is the dominant note in Count Tolstoy's philosophy. It is not only the only weapon of defense which he recognizes, but it is the only means by which he would influence others. It is both his shield and his sword. He is a deeply religious man, notwithstanding the fact that he was a few years ago excommunicated by the Russian church. In one of his essays he has defined religion as follows:

"True religion is a relation, accordant with reason and knowledge, which man establishes with the infinite life surrounding him, and it is such as binds his life to that infinity, and guides his conduct."

He not only takes his stand boldly upon the side of spiritual, as distinguished from material, philosophy, but he administers a rebuke to those who assume that religious sentiment is an indication of intellectual weakness or belongs to the lower stages of man's development. In his essay on "Religion and Morality," to which he referred me for his opinion on this subject, he says:

"Moreover, every man who has ever, even in childhood, experienced religious feeling, knows by personal experience that it was evoked in him, not by external, terrifying, material phenomena, but by an inner consciousness, which had nothing to do with the fear of the unknown forces of nature—a consciousness of his own insignificance, loneliness and guilt. And, therefore, both by external observation and by personal experience, man may know that religion is not the worship of gods, evoked by superstitious fear of the invisible forces of nature, proper to men only at a certain period of their development; but is something quite independent either of fear or of their degree of education—a something that cannot be destroyed by any development of culture. For man's consciousness of his finiteness amid an infinite universe, and of his sinfulness (i. e., of his not having done all he might and should have done) has always existed and will exist as long as man remains man."

If religion is an expression of "man's consciousness of his finiteness amid an infinite universe, and of his sinfulness," it cannot be outgrown until one believes himself to have reached perfection and to possess all knowledge, and observation teaches us that those who hold this opinion of themselves are not the farthest advanced, but simply lack that comprehension of their own ignorance and frailty which is the very beginning of progress.

Count Tolstoy is an advocate of the doctrine of non-resistance. He not only believes that evil can be overcome by good, but he denies that it can be overcome in any other way. I asked him several questions on this subject, and the following dialogue presents his views:

Q. Do you draw any line between the use of force to avenge an injury already received, and the use of force to protect yourself from an injury about to be inflicted?

A. No. Instead of using violence to protect myself, I ought rather to express my sorrow that I had done anything that would make anyone desire to injure me.

Q. Do you draw a line between the use of force to protect a right and the use of force to create a right?

A. No. That is the excuse generally given for the use of violence. Men insist that they are simply defending a right, when, in fact, they are trying to secure something that they desire and to which they are not entitled. The use of violence is not necessary to secure one's rights; there are more effective means.

Q. Do you draw any distinction between the use of force to protect yourself and the use of force to protect some one under your care—a child, for instance?

A. No. As we do not attain entirely to our ideals, we might find it difficult in such a case not to resort to the use of force,but it would not be justifiable, and, besides, rules cannot be made for such exceptional cases. Millions of people have been the victims of force and have suffered because it has been thought right to employ it; but I am now old and I have never known in all my life a single instance in which a child was attacked in such a way that it would have been necessary for me to use force for its protection. I prefer to consider actual rather than imaginary cases.

I found later that this last question had been answered in a letter on non-resistance addressed to Mr. Ernest Crosby, in 1896, (included in a little volume of Tolstoy's Essays and Letters recently published by Grant Richards, Leicester Square, London, and reprinted by Funk & Wagnalls of New York). In this letter he says:

"None of us has ever yet met the imaginary robber with the imaginary child, but all the horrors which fill the annals of history and of our own times came and come from this one thing—that people will believe that they can foresee the results of hypothetical future actions."

When I visited him he was just finishing an introduction to a biographical sketch of William Lloyd

Garrison, his attention having been called to Garrison by the latter's advocacy of the doctrine of non-resistance.

Tolstoy, in one of the strongest essays that he has written—an essay entitled "Industry and Idleness"—elaborates and defends the doctrine advanced by a Russian name Bondaref, to the effect that each individual should labor with his hands, at least to the extent of producing his own food. I referred to this and asked him for a brief statement of his reasons. He said that it was necessary for one to engage in manual labor in order to keep himself in sympathy with those who toil, and he described the process by which people first relieve themselves of the necessity of physical exertion and then come to look with a sort of contempt upon those who find it necessary to work with their hands. He believes that lack of sympathy lies at the root of most of the injustice which men suffer at the hands of their fellows. He holds that it is not sufficient that one can remember a time when he earned his bread in the sweat of his brow, but that he must continue to know what physical fatigue means and what drudgery is, in order that he may rightly estimate his brother and deal with him as a brother. In addition to this he says that, when one begins to live upon the labor of others, he is never quite sure that he is earning his living. Let me quote his language: "If you use more than you produce you cannot be quite content, if you are a conscientious man. Who can know how much I work? It is impossible. A man must work as much as he can with his hands,

taking the most difficult and disagreeable tasks, that is, if he wishes to have a quiet conscience. Mental work is much easier than physical work, despite what is said to the contrary. No work is too humble, too disagreeable, to do. No man ought to dodge work. If I dodge work I feel guilty. There are some people who think they are so precious that other people must do the dirty, disagreeable work for them. Every man is so vain as to think his own work most important. That is why I try to work with my hands by the side of workingmen. If I write a book, I cannot be quite sure whether it will be useful or not. If I produce something that will support life, I know that I have done something useful."

Tolstoy presents an ideal, and while he recognizes that the best of efforts is but an approach to the ideal, he does not consent to the lowering of the ideal itself or the defense of anything that aims at less than the entire realization of the ideal. He is opposed to what he calls palliatives, and insists that we need the reformation of the individual more than the reformation of law or government. He holds that the first thing to do is to substitute the Christian spirit for the selfish spirit. He likens those who are trying to make piecemeal progress, to persons who are trying to push cars along a track by putting their shoulders against the cars. He says that they could better employ their energy by putting steam in the engine, which would then pull the cars. And the religious spirit he defines as "such a belief in God and such a feeling of responsibility to God as will manifest itself both in the wor-

ship of the Creator and in fellowship with the created."

During the course of his conversation he touched on some of the problems with which the various nations have to deal. Of course he is opposed to war under all circumstances, and regards the professional soldier as laboring under a delusion. He says that soldiers, instead of following their consciences, accept the doctrine that a soldier must do what he is commanded to do, placing upon his superior officer the responsibility for the command. He denies that any individual can thus shift the responsibility for his conduct. In speaking of soldiers, he expressed an opinion that indicates his hostility to the whole miltary system. He said that soldiers insisted upon being tried by military men and military courts, and added: "That is amusing. I remember that when that plea was made in a case recently, I retorted that if that was so, why was not a murderer justified in demanding a trial at the hands of murderers, or a burglar in demanding trial by a jury of burglars. That would be on all fours with the other proposition."

He is not a believer in protection, and regards a tariff levied upon all of the people for the benefit of some of the people as an abuse of government and immoral in principle. I found that he was an admirer of Henry George and a believer in his theory in regard to the single tax.

He is opposed to trusts. He says that the trust is a new kind of despotism and that it is a menace to modern society. He regards the power that it gives men to oppress their fellows as even more dangerous than its power to reap great profits.

He referred to some of our very rich men and declared that the possession of great wealth was objectionable, both because of its influence over its possessor and because of the power it gave him over his fellows. I asked him what use a man could make of a great fortune, and he replied: "Let him give it away to the first person he meets. That would be better than keeping it." And then he told how a lady of fortune once asked his advice as to what she could do with her money (she derived her income from a large manufacturing establishment) and he replied that if she wanted to do good with her money she might help her work-people to return to the country, and assist them in buying and stocking their farms. "If I do that," she exclaimed in dismay, "I would not have any people to work for me, and my income would disappear."

As all are more or less creatures of environment, Tolstoy's views upon religion have probably been colored somewhat by his experience with the Greek church. He has, in some instances, used arguments against the Greek church which are broad enough to apply to all church organizations. He has not always discriminated between the proper use of an organization, and the abuse of the power which a large organization possesses. While animated by a sincere desire to hasten the reign of universal brotherhood, and to help the world to a realization of the central thought of Christ's teachings, he has not, I think, fully appreciated the great aid which a church organization can lend when properly directed. In the work in which

Tolstoy is engaged, he will find his strongest allies among church members to whom the commandment "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" is not merely sound philosophy, but a divine decree. These will work in the church and through the church, while he stands without raising his voice to the same God and calling men to the same kind of life.

His experience with the arbitrary methods of his own government has led him to say things that have been construed as a condemnation of all government. He as seen so much violence and injustice done in the name of the government, that it is not strange that the evils of government should impress him more than its possibilities for good. And yet those who believe that a just government is a blessing can work with him in the effort to secure such remedial measures as he asks for in his letter "To the Czar and His Assistants."

Tolstoy's career shows how despotic is the sway of the heart and how, after all, it rules the world, for while his literary achievements have been admired, the influence which they have exerted is as nothing compared with the influence exerted by his philosophy. People enjoy reading his character sketches, his dialogues and his descriptions of Russian life, but these do not take hold upon men like his simple presentation of the doctrine of love, exemplified in his life as clearly as it is expressed by his pen. Many of his utterances are denied publication in Russia, and when printed abroad cannot be carried across the border, and yet he has made such a powerful impression upon the

world that he is himself safe from molestation. He can say with impunity against his government and against the Greek church, what it would be perilous for others to say, and his very security is proof positive that in Russia thought inspired by love is, as Carlyle has declared it to be everywhere, stronger than artillery parks.

NOTES ON EUROPE.

In the articles written on the different European nations visited I confined myself to certain subjects, but there are a number of things worthy of comment which were not germane to the matters discussed. I shall present some of these under the above head.

An American who travels in England in the winter time is sure to notice the coldness of the cars. The English people do not seem to notice this, for if they did the matter would certainly be remedied; but the stranger who has to wrap up in blankets and keep his feet upon a tank of hot water, makes comparisons between the comfort of the American railway cars and those of England, much to the disadvantage of the latter. On the continent the temperature of the cars is higher and travel more pleasant.

Sheep graze in the very suburbs of London. This was a surprise to me. I saw more sheep in the little traveling that I did in England than I have seen in the United States east of the Mississippi River in years of travel. But after one has enjoyed for a few days the English mutton chop, the best in the world, he understands why English sheep are privileged to graze upon high priced lands.

No stranger visits London without seeing the Parliament Building. It is an imposing structure viewed from the outside, and has many handsome rooms and corridors, but the House of Parliament

is disappointing. The chamber occupied by the members of Parliament is small compared with the number of members. There are no desks and the benches will not accommodate more than half of the membership. It is evident that they do not expect a full attendance. The gallery is also diminutive and capable of seating but a few persons. And yet, Parliament rules England. It is the great legislative body of the British Isles, and all important questions are settled there. When Parliament declares against a policy of the Government, the Government bows to its will and summons the leader of the opposition to form a new cabinet. While the House of Lords has the legal right to oppose measures that arise in Parliament, it seldom does so; and while the king has a legal right to veto, that right has not been exercised for a long time. When one considers the paramount influence of Parliament over the English Government, he understands why men like Gladstone would prefer to be in Parliament rather than in the House of Lords.

The House of Lords is much more elegantly furnished than Parliament, but it excites curiosity rather than interest. It, too, is small compared with the number of Lords; but as the Lords seldom attend, the accommodations are ample. Only three members are required to constitute a quorum, and it is easy therefore to get together enough to acquiesce in measures that pass Parliament. So far as any real influence is concerned the House of Lords might as well be abolished; and as only three are necessary to constitute a quorum, it would only be necessary to reduce the nec-

essary number by three and make none a quorum to entirely remove this legislative body from consideration.

The Courts of England are a matter of interest to American lawyers, and a matter of curiosity to other Americans. As our Supreme Judges wear gowns, the gown is not so unfamiliar to us; but the wig, which is still worn by the English judges, barristers and solicitors, is not seen in this country. The wig is made of white curly hair and does not reach much below the ears. When the wearer has black hair, or red hair, or in fact hair of any color except white, the contrast between the wig and the natural hair sometimes excites a smile from those who are not impressed with the necessity for this relic of ancient times. In one of the court rooms which I visited, a son of Charles Dickens was arguing a case, and while I did not recognize any of the brilliancy and humor that have led me to place Dickens at the head of the novelists whom I have read, the son is said to be a reasonably successful lawyer. In one of the Admiralty Courts a very bushy headed wharfman was testifying to a salvage contract which he had made and he was quite emphatic in his assertions that the terms were "'alf and 'alf."

In one of the court rooms Lord Alverstone was presiding, and I had the pleasure of meeting him afterwards at dinner in Lincoln Inn Court. He is one of the finest looking men whom I met in England. He rendered a decision in favor of the United States in the matter of the recent arbitration with Canada.

Ambassador Joseph Choate placed me under obligations to him, as did also Secretary of the Legation, Henry White, by their many courtesies extended.

At Mr. Choate's table I had the pleasure of meeting Right Hon. A. J. Balfour, the present Premier. He strikes one as a scholarly man rather than as a parliamentary fighter. He has had a remarkable official career. As he was and is still a bimetallist, I found him a congenial man to have at my right. Mr. Richie, who left the Cabinet because of a disagreement with Mr. Balfour on the Fiscal question, sat at my left, and as he was an ardent opponent of protection, I had no trouble conversing with him. I learned afterwards that Mr. Balfour and Mr. Richie had not met since the Cabinet rupture. Among those present at the table was Hon. Leonard Courtney, for many years a member of Parliament. He was a member of the Royal Commission that presented the now world renowned report on falling prices. He also took an active part in opposing the war against the Boers. In appearance he reminds one of Senator Allen G. Thurman, having something of the same strength and ruggedness of feature. I am indebted to him for an opportunity to visit Lincoln Inn Court, where I met a number of other eminent judges besides Lord Alverstone.

Mr. Moreton Frewen was also a guest of Ambassador Choate on that occasion. He has frequently visited the United States and has written much on the subject of silver. When he came to the United States soon after the election in 1896, and was told that there

had been some repeating in some of the cities, he inquired, "Is it not twice as honest to vote twice for honest money as to vote once?" I found, however, that he was working with the Chamberlain protectionists, who, by the way, call themselves "tariff reformers." He had found a Bible passage which he was using on the stump. It was taken from Genesis. Pharaoah said to some one who inquired of him, "Go unto Joseph; what he saith to you, do." It seems, however, from the more recent elections, that the people have refused to identify the modern Joseph with the ancient one.

At Mr. Choate's table the subject of story telling was discussed, and some comment made about the proverbial slowness of the Englishman in catching the point of American stories. I determined to test this with a story and told of the experience of the minister who was arguing against the possibility of perfection in this life. He asked his congregation, "Is there any one here who is perfect?" No one arose. "Is there any one in the congregation who has ever seen a perfect person?" No one arose. Continuing his inquiry, he asked, "Is there any one here who has ever heard of a perfect person?" A very meek little woman arose in the rear of the room. He repeated his question to be sure that she understood, and as she again declared that she had heard of such a person, he asked her to give the name of the perfect person of whom she had heard. She replied, "My husband's first wife." All of the Englishmen at the table saw the point of the story

at once, and one of them remarked that he thought the story would be appreciated wherever domestic life is known.

While the English are not given to the telling of stories as much as the Americans are, it must not be inferred that they are deficient in a sense of humor, The Briton is really fond of fun, as any one must conclude who reads English literature or listens to English speeches. English humor, however, is of the quiet and continuous style rather than of the bubbling and explosive variety.

It was my good fortune to meet in London, Mr Sidney Webb and his talented wife, both of whom have written extensively on municipal ownership and industrial co-operation.

One of the most interesting figures in European journalism is Sir Alfred Harmsworth, proprietor of the London Daily Mail. He has achieved a remarkable success and is still a young man. His country home, some thirty miles out from London, is an old English castle which he recently secured for a long term of years. The house was built more than three hundred years ago by one of the kings for a favorite courtier. The estate is large enough to include farm and pasture lands and a well stocked hunting preserve. Lady Harmsworth is one of the most beautiful women in the kingdom and entertains lavishly.

The average foreigner does not have any higher opinion than the American does of those "international marriages" by means of which some of the decaying estates of titled foreigners are being restored.

but there are many marriages between our people and Europeans which rest upon affection and congeniality. The union of Rt. Hon. Joseph Chamberlain and the daughter of Ex-Secretary Endicott, who was at the head of the Navy Department during Mr. Cleveland's first administration, is a notable illustration. Mrs. Chamberlain is a charming and accomplished woman and justly popular with the Britons as well as with the Americans who visit England.

The American tourist is sure to find some of his countrymen stranded in London. I met several of them. Most of them represented themselves as related to prominent political friends, and these I could assist without inquiring too closely into the alleged relationship, but one case of a different kind failed to appeal to me. A lady who attached a high sounding title to her name sent her secretary to solicit aid. He represented her as an American who had against her parents' wishes married a titled Englishman; her husband had deserted her and her physician had told her that her health required that she spend the winter in Southern France. Her American relatives were rich, I was assured, but she was too proud to let them know of her misfortune. It was a sad story even when told by a secretary (how she could afford one I do not know), but I did not feel justified in encouraging a pride that led her to make her wants known to strangers rather than to her own kin.

In my article on the growth of municipal ownership (it will be found on another page), I referred to the work of John Burns, the noted labor leader of

London. I may add here that his seven or eight years old son is the handsomest child that I saw in England. I was on the stage at Lord Roseberry's meeting and my attention was attracted to a child of unusual beauty sitting just in front of me. I asked the gentleman at my side whether he was a fair sample of the English boy; he replied that he was an excellent representative. Soon afterward the mother introduced herself to me as the wife of John Burns. I thought it an interesting co-incidence that I should admire the child unconscious of his relationship to the man who had the day before impressed me so favorably.

And, speaking of Mr. Burns, I reproduce below an item which appeared in one of the London papers the day after I returned Mr. Burns' call. He sent it to me with the remark that it probably differed from the personal items to which I was accustomed. It reads:—

"Mr. Burns' Mysterious Visitor.

"Just before ten o'clock this (Friday) morning a hansom cab (plentifully bespattered with gilt coronets) stopped outside the residence of Mr. Burns, Lavender Hill. A person alighted and was received with every appearance of cordiality by Mr. Burns, who escorted him into the house. We believe the visitor was Lord Roseberry; he certainly bore a striking resemblance to that childlike peer. Possibly, however, it was only the King of Italy. In diplomatic circles it has been known for a long time that his Italian Majesty intended to visit the Municipal Mecca for much the same reasons that induced Peter the Great of Russia to come to England. It was known, also, that he

would come in some sort of disguise. That Mr. Burns' visitor this morning was a person of importance is evidenced by the fact that a constable in uniform and two or three other men (probably secret service officers) were in waiting when the cab drew up. They stood round the visitor and the constable saluted respectfully. A uniformed policeman had been in the neighborhood of Mr. Burns' house and the "Crown" all the morning.

(Note—It was an ordinary cab and no policemen or secret service men were in sight.—Editor.)

Westminster Abbey is one of the places which the visitor cannot well neglect. It was originally the burial place of royalty, and as the guide shows you the tablets and statues which perpetuate the memory of warrior kings and tells you how this king killed that one, and that king killed another, you recall the story of the American minister who concluded a very short discourse at the funeral of a man of questionable character by saying, "Some believe that he was a tolerable good man, while others believe that he was a very bad man, but whether he was good or bad we have this consolation, that he is dead." It is a relief to pass from the bloody annals of the earlier days and from the bloody deeds of ancient royalty to that part of the building which is honored by memorials of the great men in modern English life. To the American the most noted of those recently buried in Westminster Abbey was Gladstone. His life spanned the present and the past generation, and his character and talents are regarded as a part of the heritage of English speaking people.

A description of the Art Gallery, the public buildings, the Tower, and of the many interesting and historic places would occupy more space than I can spare at this time.

I shall pass from England with one observation. Upon the streets of London, and in fact throughout the British Isles, the rule is to "turn to the left." The American notices this at once, and until he becomes accustomed to it he is in danger of collision. If England and the United States ever come together in an unfriendly way, it will probably be accounted for by the difference in our rules. We will be turning to the right while she will be turning to the left.

Queenstown, Ireland, the first town to greet the tourist when he reaches Northern Europe and the last to bid him farewell when he departs, is a quaint and interesting old place. It is near the City of Cork, and the names upon the signs—the Murphys, the McDonalds, the O'Briens, etc., are so familiar that one might suppose it to be an American colony. Here the returning traveler has a chance to spend any change which he has left, for black thorn canes and shillalahs, "Robert Emmett" and "Harp of Erin" handkerchiefs and lace collars are offered in abundance. The price of these wares has been known to fall considerably as the moment of departure approaches. At Queenstown one can hear the Irish brogue in all its richness and if he takes a little jaunt about the town he can enjoy the humor for which the Irish are famed.

Scotland has a hardy population, due probably to the climate. Even near the southern boundary, the

weather was quite wintry before Thanskgiving Day of last year. Scotch plaids are in evidence at the stores and the visitor has an opportunity to buy traveling blankets bearing the figures and the colors of the various Scottish clans. As I visited Scotland to study municipal ownership I reserved for a future trip a visit to the places of natural and historic interest.

Strange that a narrow channel should make such a difference as there is between the Englishman and the Frenchman. Some one has said, "Not only is England an island, but each Englishman is an island." This puts the case a little too strongly, but one notices that the French are much more gregarious than the English and more inclined to sociability. Their attention to strangers while not more sincere is more marked.

Paris seems to be the favorite place for residence for Americans who desire to live in Europe. The climate is milder, the attractions are more numerous and the cooking, it is said, is the best in the world.

The automobile seems to have captured Paris, possibly because of its many wide streets and boulevards.

While the tipping system may not be worse in France than in other countries, it is certainly nowhere more fully developed. It is said that in some of the fashionable restaurants of Paris the tips are so valuable that the waiters, instead of receiving wages, pay a bonus for a chance to serve. But all over Europe service of every kind is rewarded with tips, and a failure to comply with the custom makes the delinquent a persona non grata. At the hotels all the at-

tendants seem to get notice of the intended departure of a guest and they line up to receive a remembrance---porter, chambermaid, valet, bell-boy, elevator man, and some whose faces are entirely new to the guest. The cab-drivers collect the fare fixed by city ordinance and expect a tip besides. Ten per cent is the amount usually given and anything less fails to elicit thanks. An Irish jaunting car driver at Queenstown took out his tip in making change. While the traveller is often tempted to rebel against the tip system as it is found in Europe, he finally concludes that he can not reform a continent in one brief visit and submits with as good grace as possible.

Guides can be found at all the leading hotels and they are well worth what they charge. They are acquainted with all places of interest, and can act as interpreters if one wants to make enquiries or do shopping.

The rivers of Europe which have been immortalized in poetry and song---the rivers whose names we learn when as children we study geography—are a little disappointing. The Thames at London, the Seine at Paris, the Tiber at Rome, the Danube at Vienna, the Spree at Berlin, the Po in northern Italy, and the Rhine are not as large as fancy has pictured; but the lakes of Switzerland surpass description.

I regretted that I could not visit the Bay of Naples, for I never think of it without recalling the lines:

I care not if
My little skiff
Float swift or slow
From cliff to cliff.
With dreamful eyes
My spirit lies
Under the walls
Of Paradise.

Surely it must be a delightfully restful place if it justifies the description given by the poet.

I was disappointed that I did not have time to see more of Germany. Berlin was the only city in which I stopped, and the fact that the Holiday festivities were at their height made it difficult to prosecute any investigation. In another article I have discussed the German socialistic propaganda, and I shall here content myself with calling attention to their railroad system. The total railroad mileage at the end of the year 1900, as reported by the American consul, was 28,601. Of this mileage private companies owned 2,573, and the federal government 798, the remainder was owned by the various German states, some of the states owning but a few miles of line. The ownership of the railroads by the various states does not in the least interfere with the operation of the lines. The plan in operation in Germany suggests the possibility of state ownership in this country as distinguished from federal ownership.

In Austria I saw for the first time the systematic cultivation of forests. In some places the various plantings were near enough together to show trees of

all sizes. At one side the trees were but a few feet in height while those at the other side of the forest were being converted into fuel.

Vienna, the capital of Austria, is not the "Old Vienna" which was re-produced at the Chicago World's Fair and at the Buffalo Exposition, but is a substantial, new, and up-to-date city. The stores exhibit an endless variety of leather goods, and I found there, as also in Belgium, many novelties in iron, steel and brass.

Russia deserves more attention than I could give it in the articles on Tolstoy and the czar. It is a land of wonderful resources and possibilities, and is making great progress considering the fact that a large proportion of the population has so recently emerged from serfdom. The peasants live in villages as in France and their life is primitive compared with life in the larger cities. There has been rapid growth in manufacturing, commerce and art. Besides furnishing one of the greatest of novelists, Tolstoy, who is also the greatest of living philosophers, Russia has given to the world many others who are prominent in literature and in art. There is an art gallery at Moscow devoted almost entirely to the work of Russian artists. Here one finds a most interesting collection, a large number of the pictures being devoted to home scenes and historic events. In this gallery the nude in art is noticeable by its absence. In the art gallery at St. Petersburg most of the paintings are by foreign artists. There is in this gallery a wonderful collection of cameos, jewelry and precious stones.

I found in Russia a very friendly feeling toward

the United States. Prince Hilkoff, who is at the head of the Siberian railroad, speaks English fluently, as do nearly all the other prominent officials. He informed me that he visited the United States about 1858 and crossed the plains by wagon. He inquired about the Platte river and its branches and remembered the names of the forts along the route.

The driving horses of St. Petersburg are the best that I saw in Europe. They are round, strongly built, graceful in form and even in gait. They are not as speedy as the standard-bred trotters, but they are hardy and sufficiently fast. A peculiar yoke or half yoke is used to which the harness is fastened. It is at the end of the shafts and rises considerably above the shoulders. Often three horses are driven abreast. In such case the horse in the center is trained to carry his head up and the horses on either side turn their heads out. They present a very attractive appearance when fastened to the sleigh or to the drosky.

I have spoken in another article of the deep hold which the Greek church has upon the people of Russia. A story which I heard in St. Petersburg illustrates this. An American residing there asked her cook to go to the market after some pigeons, or doves as they are more often called. The latter was horrified at the thought and refused, saying, "The Holy Ghost descended upon our Saviour in the form of a dove and it might be in one of these." Another American was rebuked by her servant who when told to throw something out of the window replied "This is Easter and Christ is risen. He might be passing by at this moment."

In Russia we find the extremes. The government is the most arbitrary known among civilized nations and yet in Russia are to be found some of the most advanced and devoted advocates of civil liberty. Nowhere is the doctrine of force more fully illustrated and yet from Russia come the strongest arguments in favor of non-resistance. The poison and the antidote seem to be found near together in the world of thought as well as in the physical world.

Thanksgiving Address

Delivered at the Banquet given by The American Society of London at the Hotel Cecil, London, November 26, 1903

THANKSGIVING DAY ADDRESS

Mr. Chairman, Your Excellency, Your Grace, My Lords, Ladies and Gentlemen: It is I who have reason to be grateful to the American Society for the opportunity of meeting so many of my own countrymen and English men and women who are so like my countrymen that I cannot, looking down the tables, tell which is which. I am not surprised to find that the ladies of England are so handsome as to be taken for Americans, for I have found the ladies everywhere handsome enough for the men, but I have been a little surprised to find that I could not tell an Englishman from an American on the street here. And as I have a high opinion of the American, I cannot have a low opinion of the Englishman. (Cheers.) It is proper that I should express my gratitude tonight for several things. I am grateful to our distinguished ambassador for the courtesies he has shown me, and I have the advantage of him in one respect, I had seen and heard him before. Once when I was in Washington, a young man then, I went into the supreme court of the United States, and heard a lawyer arguing a case. I was so impressed with the appearance of the man and with the manner of his speech that I inquired who this lawyer might be, and was told that it was Mr. Choate of New York. From that time to this I have looked back

to that occasion, and I have never found in my country a lawyer who measured higher than he did. (Cheers.) I am grateful to him for his kind words, although in doing me what he intended for a kindness he has somewhat embarrassed me, and if I were to give full credit to what he has said I am afraid I might soon be like the young lady whose sweetheart praised her until she became so vain that she would not speak to him. (Laughter.) This society, I am informed, celebrates two occasions, the Fourth of July and Thanksgiving Day. On the Fourth of July we celebrate our independence; on Thanksgiving Day we acknowledge our dependence. And it is proper that Mr. Choate should be a conspicuous figure on both occasions, because on on the Fourth of July we boast of what we have done, and on Thanksgiving Day we feel grateful for what we have received, and we are both proud of, and grateful for, Ambassador Choate. (Laughter and cheers.) On the Fourth of July the eagle seems a little larger than it does on any other day, and its scream may grate more harshly on the foreign ear than it does at any other time. But on this day we cultivate reverence and express our appreciation of those blessings that have come to our country without the thought or aid of Americans. We have reason to look with some degree of pride upon the achievement of the United States; we contemplate the present with satisfaction, and look to the future with hope; and yet on this occasion we may well remember that we are but building upon the foundations that have been laid for us. We did not create the fertile soil that is the basis of our

agricultural greatness; the streams that drain and feed our valleys were not channelled by human hands. We did not fashion the climate that gives us the white cotton belt of the south, the yellow wheat belt of the north, and the central corn belt that joins the two and overlaps them both. We do not gather up the moisture and fix the date of the early and later rains; we did not hide away in the mountains the gold and the silver; we did not store in the earth the deposits of copper and of zinc; we did not create the measures of coal and the beds of iron. All these natural resources, which we have but commenced to develop, are the gift of Him before Whom we bow in gratitude tonight. (Loud cheers.) Nor are we indebted to the Heavenly Father alone, for we have received much from those who are separated from us by the Atlantic. If we have great and flourishing industries we must not forget that every nation in Europe has sent us its trained and skilled artisans. If we have made intellectual progress, we must remember that those who crossed the ocean as pioneers brought with them their intelligence and their desire for learning. Even our religion is not of American origin. Like you, we laid the foundations of our church in the Holy Land, and those who came in the Mayflower and in other ships brought a love of religious liberty. Free speech, which has been developed in our country, and which we prize so much, is not of American origin. Since I have been here I have been profoundly impressed with the part that Englishmen have taken in establishing the right of free speech. (Cheers.) And I may say that before I came

to this country the thing that most challenged my admiration in the Englishman was his determination to make his opinion known when he had an opinion that he thought should be given to the world. (Cheers.) Passing through the Bank of England, to which my friend, the ambassador, has referred, my attention was called to a protest that Admiral Cochrane wrote upon the bank note with which he paid the thousand pounds fine that had been assessed against him. I was interested in that protest because it showed a fearlessness that indicates the possibilities of the race. Let me read what he said: "My health having suffered by long and close confinement, and my oppressors having resolved to deprive me of property or life, I submit to robbery to protect myself from murder (laughter) in the hope that I shall live to bring the delinquents to justice." (Renewed laughter.) That is the spirit that moves the world! There was a man in prison. He must pay his fine in order to gain his liberty. He believed the action of the court unjust. He knew that if he stayed there he would lose his life and lose the chance for vindication, and yet, as he was going forth from the prison doors, he did not go with bowed head or cringing, but flung his protest in the face of his oppressors, and told them he submitted to robbery to protect his life in the hope that, having escaped from their hands, he might bring them to justice. I like that in the Englishman, and during my short knowledge of public affairs I have looked across the ocean and admired the moral courage and the manliness of those Englishmen who have dared to stand out against

overwhelming odds and assert their opinions before the world. (Cheers.) We sometimes feel that we have a sort of proprietary interest in the principles of government set forth in the Declaration of Independence. That is a document which we have given to the world, and yet the principles set forth therein were not invented by an American. Thomas Jefferson expressed them in felicitous language and put them into permanent form, but the principles had been known before. The doctrine that all men are created equal, that they are endowed with inalienable rights, that governments were instituted amongst men to secure these rights, and that they derived their just power from the consent of the governed—this doctrine which stands four square with all the world was not conceived in the United States, it did not spring from the American mind—aye, it did not come so much from any mind as it was an emanation from the heart, and it had been in the hearts of men for ages. (Cheers.) Before Columbus turned the prow of his ship towards the west on that eventful voyage, before the Barons wrested Magna Charta from King John—yes, before the Roman legions landed on the shores of this island —aye, before Homer sang—that sentiment had nestled in the heart of man, and nerved him to resist the oppressor. That sentiment was not even of human origin. Our own great Lincoln declared that it was God Himself who implanted in every human heart the love of liberty. Yes, when God created man, He gave him life. He linked to life the love of liberty, and what God hath joined together let no man put

asunder. (Cheers.) We have received great blessings from God and from all the world, and what is our duty? We cannot make return to those from whom those gifts were received. It is not in our power to make return to the Father above. Nor can we make return to those who have sacrificed so much for our advancement. The child can never make full return to the mother whose life trembled in the balance at its birth, and whose kindness and care guarded it in all the years of infancy. The student cannot make full return to the teacher who awakened the mind, and aroused an ambition for a broader intellectual life. The adult cannot make full return to the patriarch whose noble life gave inspiration and incentive. So a generation cannot make return to the generation gone; it must make its return to the generations to come. Our nation must discharge its debt not to the dead, but to the living. How can our country discharge this great debt? In but one way, and that is by giving to the world something equal in value to that which it has received from the world. And what is the greatest gift that man can bestow upon man? Feed a man and he will hunger again; give him clothing and his clothing will wear out; but give him a noble ideal, and that ideal will be with him through every waking hour, lifting him to a higher plane of life, and giving him a broader conception of his relations to his fellows. I know, therefore, of no greater service that my country can render to the world than to furnish to the world the highest ideal that the world has known. That ideal

must be so far above us that it will keep us looking upward all our lives, and so far in advance of us that we shall never overtake it. I know of no better illustration of an ideal life than the living spring, pouring forth constantly of that which refreshes and invigorates—no better illustration of a worthless life than the stagnant pool which receives contribution from all the land around and around and gives forth nothing. (Cheers.) Our nation must make a large contribution to the welfare of the world, and it is no reflection upon those who have gone before to say that we ought to do better than they have done. We would not meet the responsibilities of today if we did not build still higher the social structure to which they devoted their lives. (Cheers.) I visited the Tower of London today and saw upon the wall a strange figure. It was made of swords, ramrods, and bayonets, and was fashioned into the form of a flower. Someone had put a card on it and aptly named it the passion flower --and it has been too often the international flower. But the world has made progress. No longer do ambition and avarice furnish a sufficient excuse for war. The world has made progress, and today you cannot justify bloodshed except in defense of a right already ascertained, and then only when all peaceable means have been exhausted. (Cheers.) The world has made progress. We have reached a point where we respect not the man who will die to secure some pecuniary advantage, but the man who will die in defense of his rights. We admire the courage of the man who is willing to die in defense of his rights, but

there is yet before us a higher ground. Is he great who will die in defense of his rights? There is yet to come the greater man—the man who will die rather than tresspass upon the rights of another. (Cheers.) Hail to the nation whatever its name may be that leads the world towards the realization of this higher ideal. I am glad that we now recognize that there is something more powerful than physical force, and no one has stated it better than Carlyle. He said that thought was stronger than artillery parks, and at last molded the world like soft clay; that behind thought was love, and that there never was a wise head that had not behind it a generous heart. The world is coming to understand that armies and navies, however numerous and strong, are impotent to stop thought. Thought inspired by love will yet rule the world. I am glad that there is a national product more valuable than gold or silver, more valuable than cotton or wheat or corn or iron—an ideal. That is a merchandise—if I may call it such—that moves freely from country to country. You cannot vex it with an export tax or hinder it with an import tariff (Cheers.) It is greater than legislators, and rises triumphant over the machinery of government. In the rivalry to present the best ideal to the world, love, not hatred, will control; and I am glad that on this Thanksgiving Day I can meet with my countrymen and their friends here assembled, return thanks for what my country has received, thanks for the progress that the world has made, and contemplate with joy the coming of that day when the rivalry between nations will be,

not to see which can injure the other most, but to show which can hold highest the light that guides the footsteps of the human race to higher ground. (Loud and prolonged cheers.)

The Pearl of the Antilles

Written for and copyrighted by Collier's Weekly, and reproduced by courtesy of that paper

THE PEARL OF THE ANTILLES.

Cuba, the largest, richest and most populous of the West Indian islands, lies about ninety miles south of Key West, the southernmost point of Florida. It is separated from the mainland by that mightiest river of the earth, the Gulf Stream, whose resistless current sweeps to the northeast through a channel half a mile deep and carries the warmth of the southern seas far into the Temperate Zone.

"The Pearl of the Antilles," as Cuba is called, is about nine hundred miles from east to west, and so narrow (about one hundred and twenty miles at its greatest width) that it looks on the map like a small arc of a great circle. Its coast line is broken by innumerable bays and harbors, many of them admirably adapted for commerce. A large part of the surface of the island is made up of rolling prairies and the land is generally fertile. In the east a mountain range rises to a considerable height, terminating in Pico Turquino, which lifts its peak to an elevation of six thousand nine hundred feet. The rivers are abundant, but are not navigable to any great extent There are a number of excellent turnpikes, many of them lined on either side with shade and flowering trees The stranger is at once attracted by the Royal Ponciana (flamboyant), a tree which grows to the height of thirty or forty feet, spreads out like a great umbrella and is covered with clusters of bright red flowers. The

royal palm is the most important tree of the island. Its slender trunk rises to a great height, and it presents an imposing appearance. Its foliage furnishes the material commonly used for the thatching of the roofs of the huts, and the bark which it sheds each year furnises the material used for making baskets, for the siding of houses and for the baling of tobacco. The wood of the royal palm, while not hard enough for building purposes, is still useful for fences and light work. This tree is so indispensable to the people of the island that it has been made a part of the Cuban coat of arms.

Cuba also produces a large variety of hard woods, the best known being mahogany and ebony; but there are others almost as beautiful and as useful. The employes of Colonel Bliss, the collector of customs at Havana, presented him a beautiful desk and cabinet upon his departure from the island. It was made by Senor Nicolas Quintana, and eighteen different kinds of wood were employed in its construction. It not only shows the variety of hard woods, but is an excellent specimen of the cabinet-maker's skill.

The climate of Cuba is mild and the temperature quite uniform. Even in the warmest part of the summer the mercury seldom rises above 92 in the shade and in the winter it does not fall below 40 or 45. The sun, however, is very hot, and for eight or nine months in the year work is practically suspended during the middle of the day.

A visitor to the island even in the month of May finds the Panama hat an indispensable companion of the men and the fan a necessary part of the apparel of

the women; and it may be added that the hats range in price from a few dollars to one hundred and the fans from a few cents to five hundred dollars. In purchasing it is well to have some one along who is a good judge of the quality of these articles, because the stranger often finds it difficult to measure the value except by the price placed upon the article and this price is sometimes adjusted according to a sliding scale.

The rainfall in Cuba varies; sometimes it amounts to one hundred inches in a year and at other times it is considerably less. The rainy season usually begins in May and ends in October or November, and during this period a rainfall of ten or twelve inches in a day is not rare; and yet the land is not badly washed.

The island is full of springs, many of them of considerable size. The city of Havana is supplied from an enormous spring which issues from the side of a hill about ten miles south of Havana. The water is clear and wholesome. The only fault that it has is a trace of lime, a characteristic of most of the spring water of the island. This spring not only supplies all the water that Havana needs, but nearly forty per cent of the flow is turned into an adjoining river as waste. The water is carried to the city through an immense aqueduct which was constructed by a Spaniard named Albear, who came from his native country with plans which were accepted and carried out by local authorities. While the expense was very great, the work was well done and is a monument to the genius of the engineer. I call particular attention to

Havana's water supply because in contemplating a visit to the island the character of the water gave me most concern, and I had resolved to rely upon Apollinaris or some other mineral water. The first day in the city, however, convinced me that the water was pure, and I drank it freely during my week's stay.

The resources of the island have not been fully developed, and many things that are imported might as well be raised at home. The diversification of the industries of the island ought to be one of the first works to engage the attention of the minister of agriculture. The cocoanut, orange and pineapple are found in reasonable abundance; a small but very palatable banana and a small lime are grown. Tomtoes, cabbages and a number of other vegetables are being cultivated, but truck gardening has not reached the perfection that it has in the United States.

At present the sugar and tobacco industries are given almost undivided attention. The sugar crop of Cuba amounted to 1,054,214 tons in the season of 1893-94. During the war it fell to as low as 212,051 tons—that was during the year 1896-97. There has been a gradual increase from that date to the present year, when it is estimated that the crop will equal 700,000 tons. This is almost all raw sugar and is sent to the United States; the exports of refined sugar do not average $3,000 per year, and the average amount exported to countries other than the United States does not exceed 1,000 tons. Cuba is exceptionally fitted for the production of sugar. The cane grows throughout the entire year and does not require re-

planting. A crop can be harvested every nine or ten months and one planting will last for from eight to fifteen years, according to the soil and care. In fact, there are instances of fields that have not been replanted for thirty or forty years.

Tobacco is not so important a crop as sugar, and yet in Pinar del Rio, the western province of the island, there is produced a variety of tobacco that has made the Havana cigar famous the world over. The tobacco exports were valued at $21,084,750 in 1899 and at $26,084,971 in 1900.

Horses and mules are sometimes used for carrying burdens, an immense sack with a large pocket on either side being thrown across the back of the animal. The ox, however, is usually employed for the cultivation of the soil and for the carrying of farm products. The American who visits the island will notice the yoke. Instead of putting the burden upon the shoulders as the American yoke does, it is fastened around the horns like the Assyrian yoke, so that the ainmals push the load with their heads.

One notices the scarcity of milk and butter. Upon inquiry I was told that the milk yielded very little cream and that the natives used butter scarcely at all. American residents, however, insisted that it was due to the fact that cows were not cared for as in the United States, and one who has had considerable experience in Cuba declared that he had fed grain to his cows and secured as good a result in both milk and butter as could be secured in the United States. The pasturage is excellent, and several Americans are plan-

ning to make an experiment in cattle raising. They claim that a steer can be raised and fattened on half the sum required in the western states. They believe that sufficient meat can be produced to supply the entire island and leave a surplus for export. Little attention has been given to the breeding of high grade hogs or cattle, and goats are apparently more numerous than sheep.

The population of Cuba numbers about one and a half million, according to the best estimates, of which the negroes constitute about one-third. Slavery was formally abolished in 1856, but the traffic continued until 1886. The slave trade thrived in Cuba after it had been abolished in the United States, and it is said that a cargo of Congo negroes was sold on the island as late as 1878.

The population is made up of Spaniards and their descendants—the former are called Spaniards and the latter Cubans. The Spaniards own the bulk of the personal property and much of the real estate, while the latter make up the majority of the voting population. During the wars which have ravaged the island the Cubans have suffered most because much of their property was confiscated or burned, while those Spaniards who were loyal to the government largely escaped. It is estimated that the lands of the island are mortgaged to more than sixty-five per cent of their present market value, the mortgages generally being given for money with which to stock and improve the farms. During the struggle for liberty the improvements were destroyed, but the mortgages escaped unharmed.

The Cuban people are as a rule docile, domestic, well-meaning and temperate. There is almost an entire absence of drunkenness. Americans admit that about the only evidences of intoxication they have seen on the island have been exhibited by the Americans.

The education of the children was much neglected during the numerous insurrections, but in no respect has the island shown more marked improvement than the attention given to the instruction of the children. During the period of American intervention the number of children in attendance at schools has increased several hundred per cent. The governor of the province of Matanzas told me that in the city of Matanzas the number of children in school there had increased from twenty-five hundred to over seven thousand within the last five years, notwithstanding the large mortality among the children during the last war. He pointed with some pride to a large building which under Spanish rule was used for a jail but is now occupied by a public school. There is at Havana, also, a large building until recently used for the storage of ammunition, which is being converted into a great university.

The religion of the island is Catholic, and almost all of the inhabitants have been baptized in that faith. This church has splendid houses of worship and many large institutions devoted to charity and benevolence. There is absolute freedom of religion, and most of the prominent Protestant denominations have representatives here. On Sunday night preceding the inauguration of the president a union patriotic service was held

and the pastors of all the Protestant churches took in the building occupied by the Congregational church, part. Some of these churches have established private schools, and these have a very satisfactory attendance.

The difference between the country and the city is very marked. In the country many of the people live in small and scantily furnished houses, each family cultivating a small tract of land. There are, however, some very large plantations, and these, of course, have commodious houses and expensive mills for the extracting of sugar from cane. In the cities the houses are built in solid blocks and have no yards. In the better houses there is usually an open court inside, but the population is crowded very closely together.

Those who have not visited Mexico or some other Spanish country will be struck by a custom which prevails in Cuba. The family carriage is usually kept in the front hall and the stable is generally a part of the house. For instance, you will find a house costing from fifty thousand to one hundred thousand dollars, with marble floors, ceilings twenty-five feet high, and with large rooms, filled with elegant furniture, paintings and statuary. In the centre will be a beautiful court, with all kinds of tropical flowers and plants, watered by a costly fountain. On the first floor will be the living rooms, in the basement will be the kitchen and the servants' rooms, and adjoining a perfectly equipped bathroom will be found the carriage room and the stable.

Havana is, of course, the city of the greatest size and interest. The Cubans call it Habana, although the

English-speaking people of the world substitute a "v" for the "b." It means a haven, and the name was first applied to a city on the southern coast and afterward given to the present city. It lies on the south shore of Havana bay, one of the best harbors in the island. It is entered by a deep but narrow channel, and is so large and well proteted that an entire fleet can ride at anchor.

The wreck of the Maine is still visible in the harbor, and is an object of intense interest to both Americans and Cubans; for to the former it recalls a great national bereavement, while the Cubans recognize that, horrible and lamentable as it was, it had an important influence in the securing of their independence. Morro Castle guards the entrance to the harbor, and it is admirably situated, as well as admirably constructed, for defense. It is built upon a cliff and its massive walls made the Spaniards feel secure from any foreign attack. Near by is Fort Cabanas, which is equally well constructed, and, having been the scene of the execution of many Cuban patriots, is equally interesting to the visitor. The formal transfer of the government from the United States to the Cuban republic gave the Cubans scarcely less pleasure than the raising of the Cuban flag over Morro and Cabanas. In fact, it is said that when, on the 11th day of May, the president-elect landed at Havana and the Cuban flag was for a short time raised over Morro, the veterans of the prolonged wars were so affected that they shouted, wept and hugged each other by turns.

Fort Principe, which crowns a natural eminence

just back of the city of Havana, is said to be the strongest fortification on the Western Hemisphere. It was constructed for the defense of Havana and will accommodate a garrison of many thousands. The city of Havana is built upon the shore of the sea and of Havana bay, the ground gradually sloping back from the water's edge toward Port Principe.

The streets are narrow, like the streets of Mexican cities, and show a reckless disregard of the points of the compass. The residences are nearly all one story, and have a window and door opening upon the street, the former invariably protected by iron bars or grating. In the middle of the window is a gate which is unlocked in the cool of the evening, and the young ladies stand at the opening and watch the passers-by. The presence of so many beautiful faces at the windows enhances the pleasure of a drive through the streets at this hour of the day. The casual admirer must be content to talk with the senorita through the bars; only an accepted suitor is admitted to the parlor, and even then he must do his courting in the presence of some older member of the family. Until the period of intervention the young ladies never went upon the street alone. Though this custom has relaxed somewhat, it is usual even now for the mother or a chaperon to accompany the daughter.

The principal street of Havana is called the Prado, and leads from the point opposite Morro Castle back into the interior of the city. It has been very much improved under General Wood's direction and is now the most beautiful part of the city. While a consider-

able sum was expended upon this improvement, the Cubans are very proud of it and it is the place most frequented in the evening. On Sundays, about sunset, the Prado is crowded. A contract has been given to an individual to furnish seats for those who desire to rest, and the city receives four thousand dollars a year for the concession. Thousands of people line this street, while every one who has a carriage or can hire one joins in the procession. On the Sunday preceding the inauguration the carriages were sometimes four abreast and the travel was so congested that it was difficult to drive faster than a walk. Here one can see Havana life in all its phases. The wealthy are out in splendid equipages, and those of more moderate means mingle with them, while on the sidewalks will be found a promiscuous crowd, all neatly dressed, and so peaceful and orderly that no officer of the law is necessary to control them.

Not far from Havana, about twelve miles to the southwest, at a beautiful little cove, is situated the house of the Havana Yacht club. It has a large membership and furnishes a delightful place for rest and recuperation. The road leading from Havana to the yacht club passes by the cemetery and Columbia Barracks.

The cemetery is an object of interest to those who are not acquainted with burial customs in tropical countries. The private vaults of the wealthy are made of cement and stone and are waterproof. A marble slab covers the grave and artificial flowers adorn the lot. Those who cannot afford to own a private vault

are buried in vaults rented for a limited time, and when the time is up the remains are removed to the bone-pile if further rent is not forthcoming. The very poor are carried to the cemetery in a rented box and buried, mother earth furnishing them their only coffin. There are a number of beautiful monuments in the Havana cemetery, the most elaborate of which is one of white marble, erected to the memory of forty volunteer firemen who lost their lives in a disastrous explosion which occurred some years ago. Next to the firemen's monument in size and even surpassing it in interest is the pile of granite and marble reared in honor of the eight students who were shot by order of one of the Spanish generals.

Columbia Barracks is the name given to the place where the American troops were encamped during the intervention. General Lee's army corps located the camp upon a beautiful knoll overlooking the sea. It proved to be a healthful place, and our soldiers suffered far less than it was feared they would when they embarked for Cuba.

From General Wood I learned that the island has been entirely purged of yellow fever and that the death rate in Havana is now lower than in Washington, D. C.

Major W. C. Gorges of the United States army, who has been in charge of the sanitary department, deserves great credit for the work that has been done in the matter of improving sanitary conditions in the island. Under his administration the mosquito theory was fully tested, and it was proven to the satisfaction of all who watched the experiment that the disease is

not transmitted by contact with the yellow fever patient but by the bite of a mosquito which has previously bitten one having the disease. Dr. Carlos Finlay of Havana some twenty-one years ago brought this terrible indictment against the mosquito and, after a fair and impartial trial, it stands convicted before the world.

Governor Jennings of Florida, who visited Cuba for the double purpose of attending the inauguration and of investigating the sanitary system of the island, was much gratified to learn of the care that is now taken to provide against and stamp out contagious diseases. Florida is so near to Cuba that his people are vitally interested in the subject. From him I learned that vaccination against smallpox has received especial attention in Cuba. A room is fitted up with the most modern scientific equipment; expert physicians are in charge; calves, first tested as to their general health, are vaccinated and kept under surveillance for five days and then placed upon a table made for the purpose and the bovine virus is extracted. This is placed in vats and, after being thoroughly prepared, is made into what are called points, each point containing sufficient virus to vaccinate five persons. One calf furnishes bovine virus enough to vaccinate 1,000 persons. The Havana institution furnishes virus for the island and the marine hospital service of the United States. Some idea of the magnitude of this institution can be gathered from the fact that 250,000 persons have been vaccinated on the island of Cuba within five months, and the care taken is shown by the fact that not a single case of death has resulted in all that number of vaccinations.

There is also at Havana a very complete disinfecting plant. The United States steamer Sanator, especially built for ship disinfection and for handling of large numbers of soldiers and passengers, arrived at Havana during the latter part of June, 1900; it is the only disinfecting steamer in the world and is provided with the most modern apparatus, including shower baths and robing and disrobing rooms sufficient to handle 1,000 persons daily. The experience of the army in Montauk Point in 1898 suggested many improvements in the matter of disinfection, and these suggestions have been utilized in the construction of this vessel. During the month of June, 1901, this steamer disinfected 40 passenger vessels, and 39 fishing smacks, making a total of 79 vessels. During the first fiscal year 463 vessels were disinfected, together with 4,360 pieces of baggage.

The public buildings of Havana are substantially constructed and will last for many years. The Spaniards had an eye to the future and built for posterity, therefore the official headquarters at Havana and the other cities are large, strong and massive.

The prison is an immense building, and though ornamental in appearance is unfortunately situated on the Prado. The condition of the prison, by the way, has been much improved during American occupancy, a fact to which the Cubans point with muh pride and satisfaction. The Palace, occupied by the governor general during Spanish rule, is a commodious structure near the wharf, and Former Governor General Wood has made his headquarters here, as have the heads of the various departments of the government.

When I called upon the mayor, the able and accomplished Senor De la Torre, I was ushered into a reception room which was formerly the crown room of the palace. There my attention was immediately attracted by two splendid oil paintings of large size. One represented Cortes landing in Cuba, and the other the landing of the Pilgrim Fathers at Plymouth Rock. In the first picture the great Spanish explorer appeared as the central figure; he was mounted upon a war-horse and around him were cannons, guns, sabres and chains. The second picture represented a group of unarmed men, women and children; one held an open book, while on the ground were spade and pick and saw. The pictures were presented in 1867, by Senor Miguel de Aldama, the wealthiest Cuban of his time, who, a year later, was a prominent leader in the war begun for the independence of Cuba. The pictures contrast the doctrine of colonization by conquest with the peaceful methods employed by those who go forth to build a new home in a new country. There is an exquisite humor in the gift and the donor would have felt fully repaid if he could have known that those pictures would for thirty years mock every kingly gathering and utter their mute protest against arbitrary power and colonel mis-government.

Bull fighting and cock fighting have been prohibited during the intervention, and "Jai Alai," a very skilful ball game, has taken their place to some extent. But for the gambling that is encouraged by the "Jai Alai" company the game would be deserving of praise.

Havana is destined to be a popular winter resort

for American tourists. It is only three and one-half days from New York by steamer and only little more than a day from southern Florida, and its climate affords a delightful retreat from the rigors of a northern winter. The hotels are well kept and sufficiently commodious for the traveling public, but as the number of American tourists increases there will doubtless spring up other hotels built and conducted upon the American plan.

The one great and overshadowing need of Havana is a sewerage system, and that subject is now being considered. It has not been thought advisable to run a sewer into the harbor because it has no outlet, and the fact that the Gulf Stream would carry into the harbor any refuse matter emptied along the seacoast makes the problem a difficult one; but that it will be soon solved is certain, and then no city on the Western Hemisphere will be more attractive to those who have the time and means for travel.

To Americans Santiago is almost as interesting as Havana, because it was the scene of the decisive land engagement of the Spanish-American war as well as the scene of one of the two great naval battles of that war. The harbor of Santiago is as well protected as the Havana harbor, but is not so large.

Nature has also done much for the harbors at Cienfuegos and Matanzas and both are prominent shipping points for the exportation of sugar. There are now more than 150,000 tons of sugar stored in the warehouses at the latter place. The harbor at Matanzas is an open one, but large vessels anchor in deep water about a mile from the wharf and have no difficulty in

loading and unloading from lighters. Like Havana, the city draws it water supply from springs, and, lying upon the side of a hill, it can be more easily drained. Captain Hay of the United States army, who was in charge of the military government as well as the custom house at that place, says that Matanzas is now the cleanest city he has ever seen. He is also authority for the statement that the Cubans are law-abiding and very easy to get along with. There is near Matanzas the famous valley of the Yumuri, an excellent view of which is obtained from the old church of Montserrat, situated on a high hill near the city. There is said to be no more beautiful view on the island, and for that matter it would be difficult to find a more pleasing one anywhere. The caves of Bellamar, about three miles from Matanzas, are also highly praised.

The Isle of Pines, which lies just south of Cuba and is still held by the United States, subject to final settlement by treaty, is said to be the healthiest of the West India islands. Much of the land of the island has been bought by Americans, and several English-speaking communities have already been established there.

THE BIRTH OF THE CUBAN REPUBLIC.

"Viva Cuba Libre!" "Viva la Republica de Cuba!" These were the exclamations of delight and of patriotism with which the Cuban people greeted the 20th day of May, 1902, the day upon which the American government of intervention formally transferred authority to the newly formed Cuban government.

For days the city of Havana had been busy with preparations for the great event. Fifty thousand dollars had been contributed by the citizens and spent in decorations. Triumphal arches towered above the streets; large Cuban flags floated from the flagstaffs of the business blocks and little flags fluttered from bamboo poles; streamers covered the buildings and patriotic mottoes and pictures of dead heroes recalled the struggle of more than thirty years, so full of sacrifice and so replete with valor, just now culminating in a glorious victory. Everywhere were evidences of joy and exultation.

From the time the president-elect landed at the wharf of Havana the people were in a state of suppressed excitement, impatiently waiting the hour for which they had looked and longed. The most notable event of the week preceding the inauguration was the banquet tendered by the Cuban veterans to Governor General Wood on Friday evening, May 16. General Maximo Gomez, the greatest of Cuban generals, the

hero of the war for independence, the idol of the Cuban patriots and the trusted friend of the new president, sat at the head of the table. On his left was President-elect Tomas Estrada Palma and on his right General Leonard A. Wood. At the same table sat the principal military and civil officials of Cuba, mingled with the officers of the United States army. The banquet tables were made to form a shield and occupied the entire floor of the Tacon Theatre, while the five galleries of that splendid auditorium were crowded with ladies and gentlemen in evening dress. The banqueters below and the spectators above presented a combination of bravery and beauty ever to be remembered.

General Gomez being a man of action rather than of words, called upon Senor Gonzalo de Quesada to act as toastmaster, and that the latter discharged his duty well was evident from the manner in which his introductions were greeted. Brief speeches were made by Senor Mario Garcia Kohly, General Fernando Freyre Andrade and myself. Then Governor General Wood was presented, and the entire audience arose and stood while he expressed in modest but felicitous language his appreciation of the courtesies shown him and his good wishes for the Cuban republic. It was an inspiring scene, the like of which has been rare in the world's history—the representative of a great and powerful government voluntarily surrendering into the hands of a comparatively small nation an authority that might have been withheld had the United States been actuated by the motives which control most nations that go to war. It was an act of magnanimity and

of fidelity to principle that raised higher the flag about to be lowered—it was a moral victory more potent for good than any triumph of arms.

General Wood has had a difficult task, and while mistakes have been made and an occasional criticism is heard, these are outweighed by the positive good that has been done.

The Teller resolution, which was added to the resolution of intervention, contained the following words:

"That the United States hereby disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction or control over said island except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination, when that is accomplished, to leave the government and control of the island to its people."

If any American citizen has regretted the making of that promise or has favored its violation he would have been converted had he attended the banquet given by the veterans on Friday evening. He would have learned that love is better than homage and that our nation enjoys a greater reward than it could possibly have secured by conquest or violence.

On the Saturday night following the banquet General Wood gave a farewell reception in the same theatre, with President Palma as the guest of honor. An immense crowd was in attendance. On the same evening the leading Spanish society of the city celebrated the coronation of Spain's young king by a grand ball in the Casino Espanol. Here, amid the waving of

Spanish flags and the perfume of tropical flowers, the elite of the Spanish element met and drank the health of Alfonso XIII.

At midnight on the 19th the bells rang, the engines and boats whistled, cannons fired and each person seemed to try to make more noise than his neighbor. From that time on, for several days the city was given over to rejoicing and to the heartiest manifestations of delight. Firecrackers were exploded everywhere, and that, too, with a recklessness that would have done credit to the American small boy.

When the Spaniards evacuated Havana the beautiful statue of Queen Isabella, which stood in the centre of the most prominent park, was taken down, but the pedestal was left standing. The Cubans, to signalize the change which had taken place in their government, secured a statue such as is used in the United States to represent the Goddess of Liberty and, on the forenoon of the 20th, this statue was placed upon the pedestal. The crowds that surged by it noted and commented on the transformation that had taken place in the ideas for which their government stood. At night a light was placed in the uplifted hand of the goddess, and the Western Hemisphere beheld a new "Liberty, enlightening the world."

As the hour of noon approached the human tide that had ebbed and flowed through the streets began to form a stream, and this stream, passing through Central Park, divided, one part going in the direction of the Palace, where the formal transfer of the government was to take place, and the other passing down the Prado to the point opposite Morro Castle.

The American soldiers occupied the Placa de Armas just in front of the palace and kept clear the street between. The people filled all the other streets around, and looked down from windows and from the roofs of the neighboring buildings.

In the reception room of the palace gathered those who by special invitation were permitted to witness the simple ceremony which preceded the retirement of General Wood and the inauguration of President Palma. The room was not a large one and the number of persons admitted did not exceed one hundred and fifty or two hundred. The members of the cabinet, members of the supreme court, members of the Cuban congress, the archbishop of Cuba and his escort, the governors of the various provinces, mayors, magistrates, and a few officers of the American army and navy, with members of the diplomatic corps, newspaper men and less than a score of others gathered about the centre of the room.

I found that but few Americans outside of the military and naval officials were present. Senator James K. Jones of Arkansas, chairman of the democratic national committee; Senator Money of Mississippi and his son, Senator Mason of Illinois and wife, ex-Senator Thurston of Nebraska and wife, Congressman DeArmond of Missouri, Governor Jennings of Florida, his wife and son, a few without title and the photographers represented unofficial America. That the United States, which appointed three special envoys to witness the coronation of Edward VII. of England and one special envoy to witness the coron-

ation of Alfonso XIII. of Spain, had no envoy to testify to the interest which our people felt in the birth of a republic whose very existence was due to American intervention, was a fact frequently commented upon by both Cubans and resident Americans.

At about five minutes before twelve Governor General Wood and President-elect Tomas Estrada Palma took their positions in the center of the room. General Wood inquired for General Gomez, and a messenger having been sent to bring him from the rear of the room, he was asked to take a position next to the president. These three, together with the president's secretary, constituted the inner group. In a circle just outside this group stood Captain Scott, the adjutant general of the department of Cuba, the members of the supreme court, senate and congress and the archbishop, while crowding around these without regard to position were the remaining guests, each anxious to be near enough to hear the words spoken by the principal participants. Mrs. Palma and family stood a few feet to the rear of the president and General Wood, while General Wood's wife and the other ladies of the company occupied vantage ground near the windows.

Just at twelve a cannon shot fired at one of the forts startled the audience. It was followed by another roar and then by another. Then the whistles of the ships lying at anchor in the harbor began to blow, and the crowd outside, thinking the transfer had taken place, commenced to cheer. In the midst of this babel of noise General Wood read a brief paper to President Palma, stating that in the name and by

authority of the American government he relinquished authority over the island and surrendered it into the keeping of the new government to be administered in accordance with the constitution adopted by the people of Cuba and the Platt amendment. He then read a letter from President Roosevelt extending congratulations to President Palma and expressing his good wishes for the success and prosperity of the republic. General Wood then with a faltering voice assured President Palma of his appreciation of the courtesies shown him and of his sincere regard and good will for the new government and the Cuban people, and with this American occupation ended.

The president read from manuscript, written in Spanish his acceptance of the responsibilities of the office and, speaking for his government, promised to fulfill the terms imposed. Then in English he replied in a few heartfelt words to General Wood's farewell. General Wood extended his hand and, after a cordial greeting, the president turned to the chief justice, took the oath of office and then modestly received and acknowledged the congratulations showered upon him.

As soon as General Wood ceased speaking the American flag on the palace was lowered and the Cuban flag raised in its place amid the acclamation of the multitude. Simultaneously with the lowering of the flag on the palace building the flags that floated from the other government buildings were hauled down and Cuban flags quickly substituted for them. The crowd at the end of the Prado raised a mighty shout when the stars and stripes on Morro Castle came down and the single-star Cuban flag was flung

to the breeze; and yet, happy as they were, there was a touch of sadness in their rejoicing, for they had come to love the American flag. A member of the commission charged with the changing of the flags on Morro Castle—that grim fortress that had been the scene of so much cruelty and bloodshed—told me that when the American flag was lowered the Cuban soldiers stationed at that place rushed forward and caught it up, saying that it must not be allowed to touch the ground—they even pressed its folds to their lips. The Americans present were deeply touched by the affection displayed, and well they might be.

As soon as the ceremonies were completed at the palace General Wood and his staff officers, accompanied by the president, his cabinet, the members of the court and congress, and other officials, marched behind the escort to the wharf. The Spanish word "viva," which means "live," is used in the same way as our word "hurrah," and as the procession moved toward the boat the crowd waved and cheered "Viva General Wood," "Viva Presidente Palma," "Viva la Republica Americana," "Viva Cuba libre." All were proposed and given with equal fervor. In fact, the good will entertained for the Americans was apparent on every hand, no partiality being shown in the salutations and exclamations.

Having seen the Americans safely aboard the Brooklyn, which carried General Wood and his staff, and the Morro Castle, which carried the soldiers, President Palma and his cabinet returned to the palace and held a consultation; but the people lingered

on the Prado until the ships passed through the channel out into the sea and then waved a farewell to the government that had entered Cuba as a friend, withstood the temptations which come with the exercise of power and, as soon as a stable government was established removed the flag from the island, only to leave it enshrined in the hearts of the people.

President Palma is small in statue, but large in experience, capacity and patriotism. He is a man of education, refinement and wide acquaintance. He took part in the war of 1868, and was one of the early presidents of the government then formed. He was taken prisoner and was in a Spanish fortress when the treaty of 1878 was signed. His release was finally secured at the request of the republic of Honduras, where he had resided for a few years; but he had no faith in the promises made by Spain, and when he left the prison it was with the determination not to return to Cuba until she was an independent nation. After a brief sojourn in Honduras, where he married the daughter of the president of that republic, he moved to the United States and located at Central Valley, N. Y. There he established his home and reared his family, occupying his time and securing some income by teaching school. When he entered the war for independence a large estate which he owned was confiscated by the Spanish government, and this was afterward offered to him if he would return to Cuba and take the oath of allegiance, but he was so earnest in his desire to secure Cuban independence that he declined.

He was, however, in constant communication with the people of the island, and when the new insurrection was started in 1895 he became the head of the American junta, and it was largely through his wise and persistent efforts that the people of the United States were brought to understand the condition of affairs in the island. He is called from his long exile to be crowned with the honor of being Cuba's first chief executive.

I have become sufficiently acquainted with the man to be convinced of his greatness and goodness, and in congratulating him I expressed the hope, which I believe to be well founded, that his influence upon his people may be as far-reaching and as potent for good as the influence exerted by our first president upon the American people.

The president has selected a strong and representative cabinet; Carlos Zaldo of Havana will be minister of state and justice. He is a leader of the radical wing of the democratic-republican party, which opposed adoption of the Platt amendment to the constitution of Cuba and opposed Palma for president until his opponent (Masso) had withdrawn from the race. Senor Zaldo is a lawyer and member of the Cuban-American banking house of Zaldo & Co.

The minister of the interior will be Dr. Tamayo, a doctor and member of the nationalist or military party (headed by General Maximo Gomez) from which both Brooke and Wood drew most of their cabinet material. Dr. Tamayo is a cousin to President

Palma. He is the only member of General Wood's regime retained in office by the new executive in making up his cabinet.

Minister of Finance Garcia Montes, republican, is a lawyer and friend of General Mendez-Capote, under whom he served as a sub-secretary in the Brooke cabinet. Montes' appointment to the head of the finance department under the new republic is attributed almost solely to the personal influence of Capote. The latter voted for the Platt amendment.

The minister of agriculture, commerce and industries will be Emilo Terry, the millionaire sugar planter of central Cuba. He is also one of the leading bankers of Cienfuegos.

Minister of Public Instruction Eduardo Yero is a disciple of Jose Marti, former editor of the junta newspaper "Patria," in New York city; recently connected with the Cuban school system as a superintendent under Commissioners Frye and Hanna. He is a man of excellent educational qualifications.

Minister of Public Works Manuel Luciano Diaz is a Spaniard, and engineer and former railway superintendent.

That the people of Cuba are capable of self-government is not a question open for dispute. Henry Clay declared, in his defence of the independence of the South American republics, that God never made a people incapable of self-government; that it was the doctrine of thrones and a reflection on Jehovah to say that He created people incapable of self-government and left them to the government of kings and emperors. Clay's logic is sound. Capacity for government is

not a thing to be acquired or to be bestowed; it is inherent in the people. As individuals differ in wisdom, in self-restraint and in moral character, so nations differ, but it cannot be said that any nation has reached perfection in the science of government or in the art of administration; neither can it be said that any nation is so low down in the scale of civilization that it needs a foreign master. When Jefferson was invited to suggest laws for a French colony which located in the United States early in the nineteenth century, he declined, and gave as his reason that laws were the outgrowth of the history and habits of the people and that no alien could be sufficiently in sympathy with, or sufficiently informed about, a people to make their laws for them. Self-government is in itself a developing process and growth in capacity comes with the exercise of human rights under self-government. But one who visits Cuba and becomes acquainted with the people need not rest the case upon abstract principles, for he is convinced by observation that the Cubans not only have the right to govern themselves but also have the ability to do so. That they will make mistakes is certain, but have we not made mistakes in the United States? That they may sometimes resort to violence instead of reason is possible, but have we not done so in the United States? It is even possible that the island may occasionally be the scene of civil war, but have we not had civil war in the United States? The child will stumble and fall in its effort to walk, but is there any other means by which it can learn to walk?

Cuban independence will not give the people a government free from fault, but it will give them a government as good as they deserve to have—a government that will improve as the people themselves make progress in virtue and intelligence. Free government does not mean that each citizen will have just such a government as he wants; it simply means that the people will have such a government as the majority desire, and that each individual can present his views to his fellows with the confidence that whatever is best for all will ultimately prevail.

Several important questions will require immediate consideration. The question of sanitation will, of course, receive the attention of the new government; for Cuba cannot afford to be shut out from the outside world, and it cannot expect communication between the island and the United States unless that communication can be carried on without risk of disease.

Education is a problem of the first magnitude. While private and parochial schools can do much, the public schools must place education within the reach of every child and thus fit all for more intelligent participation in the affairs of the government. The deep and widespread interest already manifested in the improvement of school facilities gives great encouragement for the future.

It should be the policy of the government to encourage home building and home owning. Until human nature is entirely changed men will give better care and cultivation to land which they own than to

land which they rent. The stimulus that one finds in the sense of proprietorship is indispensable to the highest effort. To this end the growth of great estates should be discouraged and a wider distribution of the land encouraged.

Saving should also be encouraged and to this end government savings banks would be useful.

The government must be careful to avoid the evils of private monopoly. Man is too frail to be intrusted with the power which a monopoly gives, and the president and his advisers should be on their guard against the dangers which come with the granting of franchises and concessions for the control of any branch of business. The government of intervention has reserved to the Cuban government the right to cancel and annul all franchises granted during the temporary occupancy of the island. It will thus be within the power of the permanent government to make such conditions and impose such restrictions as may seem necessary, and it is to be hoped that means will be taken at once to protect the rights of the people.

In the procession which escorted President-elect Palma to his home when he retured from exile, a number of Cuban ladies represented the republics of the Western Hemisphere, the United States being the eldest, Cuba the youngest of the group. It reminded me of the great banyan tree under which our party rested for a moment as we passed through Key West; for are not these republics much like the banyan tree? Free government was planted upon American soil a century and a quarter ago; it grew and sent forth its

influence like branches in every direction, and these branches taking root now support the parent tree; beneath the influence of these republics, separate in their government and yet united in their aspirations an ever-increasing multitude finds shelter and protection. Long live the national banyan tree—the American republics!

Patriotism

Address delivered by Mr. Bryan at the banquet given by the Cuban Veterans to Governor General Wood and his staff, Friday evening, May 16, 1902

Patriotism.

Mr. Toastmaster, Ladies and Gentleman: I esteem it a great privilege and a high honor to be invited to participate in this memorable occasion. I am not here to represent the government of the United States. The distinguished soldier and citizen who has represented the American government upon the island with so much ability and success is present to represent my country in an official capacity; but as an American citizen I can congratulate you upon the realization of your hopes, and as an Amerian citizen I can give expression to the pride that I feel at the fact that our soldiers and official representatives have conducted themselves so well that the Cuban veterans tender them this complimentary dinner and express so much of gratitude and of good will.

When asked to respond to the toast, I could think of no better sentiment than "Patriotism."

Of what other sentiment could I think at a banquet given by the veterans of the Cuban army and in the presence of the great soldier (General Gomez) who sits at the head of the table tonight, and in the presence of Cuba's favorite son, Senor Estrada Palma, who is to enjoy the honor of being the first chief executive of this republic.

The word "patriotism" has been translated into every language and its spirit has been exhibited to a greater or less extent in every land, but nowhere has

more patriotism been shown than in this beautiful isle of the sea, where liberty and independence have been purchased by so much blood and sacrifice. You may well be pardoned for feeling an exultation too deep for expression and in that exultation my countrymen fully share; and yet I would be less than a friend if I failed to suggest that there are victories before you even greater than the victories already won. The work of self-government is a continuous work and one that taxes both the patience and the energy of the citizen. Under an arbitrary government where the monarch thinks and acts for the subject, the subject may be indifferent and indolent, but in a republic where the governments rests upon the consent of the governed there is no place for slothfulness.

Patriotism is a virtue which must be displayed in peace as well as in war, and may be defined as that love of country which leads the citizen to give to his country that which his country needs at the time his country needs it. In time of war the citizen may be called upon to die for his country; in time of peace he must live for his country. In time of war he may be called upon to give his body as a sacrifice; in time of peace his country demands his head and his heart, his intellect and his conscience. You have shown that you were willing to lay down your lives in order to purchase liberty, now you will be called upon to exhibit self-restraint and moral courage in dealing with the problems of government.

It is written that he who ruleth his own spirit is greater than he that taketh a city. It is too much to

expect that all things will be done as anyone would like to have them done or that everyone will receive the reward of which he and his friends may think him deserving; and in hours of disappointment it is well to remember that a person can show more patriotism by suffering for a great cause than by enjoying great rewards.

In time of war your island was divided and there was much bitterness between those who fought for independence and those who supported the authority of Spain. Now that you are about to enter upon the enjoyment of the blessings of self-government it should be your purpose to heal all the wounds and to unite the people in a common destiny. If there be those who would prefer the sovereignty of Spain to an experiment in self-government, do not abuse them, but convert them to the doctrines of free government by showing them the superiority of a republic. It may even be an advantage to those in power to have some citizens who are skeptical and ready to criticise, for it will make public officials more careful of their conduct.

Jefferson declares that free government exists in jealousy rather than in confidence, and it is certainly true that public servants are most faithful when their acts are under constant scrutiny.

One of the questions with which you will have to deal is that of public education and you will find it of advantage to lay for your republic a broad and deep foundation by providing for universal education. The citizen will appreciate the advantages of free government in proportion as his mental horizon is enlarged and his capacity for usefulness increased.

No one is wise enough to act as a censor in matters of education and select those who are to be sent to school. No one can say upon which child of today the responsibilities of the next generation will fall, hence the nation will find its security in fitting the largest possible number for full participation in all that concerns the nation's welfare.

You rejoice tonight that our nation is going to keep its promise and give the world an example of fidelity to a public trust, and yet it is a cause of congratulation to us as much as to you, for we had more to lose than you if we failed to keep the pledge made at the beginning of the Spanish war. I believe that the citizens of our country are as happy as you over the successful outcome of your heroic struggle; they will rejoice in all the good fortune that comes to you and they will grieve over any mistake that you may make. They appreciate the gratitude which you express, but they find their reward in the good they have been able to accomplish, for life's happiness is not measured by the gifts which one receives, but by the contribution which he makes to the welfare of his fellows.

Let me borrow a story which has been used to illustrate the position of the United States: A man wended his way through the streets of a great city. Unmindful of the merchandise exposed on every hand he sought out a store where birds were kept for sale. Purchasing bird after bird he opened the cages and allowed the feathered songsters to fly away. When

asked why he thus squandered his money, he replied: "I was once a captive myself and I find pleasure in setting even a bird at liberty."

The United States once went through the struggle from which you have just emerged; the American people once by the aid of a friendly power won a victory similar to that which you are now celebrating, and our people find gratification in helping to open the door that barred your way to the exercise of your political rights.

I have come to witness the lowering of our flag and the raising of the flag of the Cuban republic; but the event will bring no humiliation to the people of my country, for it is better that the stars and stripes should be indelibly impressed upon your hearts than that they should float above your heads.

Mexico

The article describing the first visit to Mexico was written for and copyrighted by the New York World, and is reproduced by courtesy of that newspaper. The article describing the second visit was written for The Commoner

MEXICO.

The First Visit.

The reading which I did preparatory to my visit to Mexico revealed to me how little I had known of the history of that country, past and current. In this connection I acknowledge my indebtedness to Senor Romero, the Mexican Minister at Washington, for advanced proofs of his book just issuing from the press, descriptive of Mexico at the present time. Senor Romero, besides being a student of great industry and research, is thoroughly familiar with our language, and his book will be of great value to both republics in that it gives to the people of the United States full and authentic information with regard to our neighbor on the south. The readers of The World may be interested in a brief reference to some of the facts which came under my observation during a three weeks' stay in the land of the Aztecs.

I found:

First—That Mexico is a delightful place to visit. Travel on the main lines is as safe, as comfortable and as cheap as in the United States. The City of Mexico is within four days' ride of Kansas City, and can be reached by three routes. The Mexican National leaves the Rio Grande at Laredo, the International at Eagle Pass and the Mexican Central at El Paso.

The weather is dry and pleasant during the win-

ter months, and the temperature high enough to be inviting to those who find the cold of the North too rigorous. The descent from the City of Mexico to Vera Cruz can be made between sunrise and sunset, and in the course of the day the traveller has an opportunity to compare the flora of two zones. As both the Mexican and the Interoceanic Railroads connect the capital with this seaport, the tourist is enabled to vary the scenery without loss of time. The new railroad which is building from the City of Mexico to Acapulco rises twenty-five hundred feet almost within sight of the City of Mexico, and then drops five thousand feet to Cuernavaca, the present terminus. The three snow-crowned peaks, Popocatapetl and Izteccihuatl and Orizaba, are magnificent mountains. Popocatapetl and Izteccihuatl are near the City of Mexico. The first-named, the largest of the three, presents the best view from Cuernavaca. All three can be seen from a point on the Interoceanic road, near Pueblo. Cathedrals built before the landing of the Pilgrims, huge public buildings, differing entirely in architecture from our own; unique Chapultepec, a national art gallery filled with rare and valuable paintings, and a museum containing innumerable relics of a civilization which antedates the discovery of the continent by Europeans—all these combine to interest and instruct.

Second—That while our nation has more inhabitants, covers more territory and possesses greater wealth, we cannot surpass the Mexicans in hospi-

tality or in the courtesy which they extend to strangers.

Third—That the Mexican authorities entertain a very friendly feeling towards the citizens of the United States, and heartily desire a continuation of the amicable relations now existing between the two nations.

Fourth—That Mexico is as firm as the United States in the support of the Monroe doctrine, having realized only thirty years ago the dangers attendant upon an attempt to extend monarchical institutions upon the western hemisphere.

Fifth—That President Diaz is entirely deserving of the enconiums bestowed upon him by his own people, by resident Americans and by visitors. He has a genius for public affairs, understands the conditions and needs of his people, and has their confidence to a degree seldom enjoyed by an executive, either hereditary or elective. While the advantages of a stable government are now so generally recognized that his death or resignation would not disturb the existing order of things, yet his qualifications have been so amply proved and his administration so completely successful that his people are unanimous in the hope that he may yet enjoy many years of official life.

Hidalgo, the warrior priest, who led the movement which resulted in independence, is called the Mexican Washington; Juarez, who successfully defended his country against Maxmilian, was the second great Mexican leader of the Nineteenth century; President Diaz, himself a brave general, by restoring order, establishing the supremacy of the civil law and

perfecting the system of public education, has earned for himself, and will enjoy in history, a place by the side of Hidalgo and Juarez.

Sixth—That the public men of Mexico are not inferior to our own in intelligence, education and general information. Senor Mariscal, secretary of foreign affairs, adds to great ability a long experience as a diplomat, and is worthy of comparison with the premiers of the leading nations of the world. Senor Limantaur, secretary of finance, is a most accomplished gentlman and has exhibited superior skill in the management of the fiscal affairs of the republic. The other cabinet officers, governors, members of the national and state congresses, mayors etc., whom I met were, without exception, men of refinement and scholarly attainments.

Seventh—That the English language is being taught more and more extensively each year, and is now understood and spoken by most of the public men or by members of their families. I was informed that a majority of the members of the federal congress could understand a speech delivered in our language. The leading hotels and stores have clerks who can speak English, so that travel and traffic are made easy.

Eighth—Mexico is making substantial progress in education. The public schools are free and attendance is compulsory. The president and those associated with him in authority are putting forth every possible effort to improve the system of instruction and to bring all the children under the influence of

the school-teacher. As an illustration, in the state of Mexico the number of schools has increased more than 100 per cent, within the last ten years, and the number of pupils in attendance shows an equal increase. The girls and boys enter school upon an equal footing, and the ambition of the pupil is stimulated by the offer of rewards for merit.

It was our good fortune to be invited to witness the distribution of prizes for the schools of the Federal District. Nothing impressed me more than the scene here presented. President Diaz delivered the awards to several hundred boys and girls. The Indian and the Spaniard, the rich and the poor, all mingle together in the public schools and vie with each other for the prizes. The state not only furnishes instruction in the elementary branches, but provides industrial training for both boys and girls, normal schools for teachers and professional schools for students of law and medicine. President Diaz recently quoted a remark made by Von Moltke in praise of the German school-teacher and also pointed out the necessity for educated mothers. He recognizes, as did Jefferson, that popular education is vital in a republic, and largely through his efforts Mexico sees a yearly increase in the number of those who are capable of intelligent participation in government.

Ninth—That the free coinage of silver is entirely satisfactory to the people of Mexico. They have had a chance to test the system thoroughly and to compare it with the systems of the United States, England, France and Germany, and I found no disposi-

tion either among the officials or among the people to favor the gold standard. The Federal Government pays about six millions annually on gold obligations, and while it is compelled to collect over twelve millions in silver to cover this interest account, it has no difficulty in doing so, because of the prosperous condition of the nation's industries. The Government is not only meeting its expenses, but has a surplus. In Mexico the producers of wealth have not encountered the disastrous fall in prices which has afflicted all the gold-standard countries since 1873. While exchange has fluctuated, the fluctuation has only affected foreign trade, and that fluctuation, while of small importance when compared with the great advantage of maintaining the level of prices, will entirely disappear when the parity between gold and silver is restored.

I found quite a number of Mexicans who went so far as to express the hope that the United States would continue the gold standard because of the advantage which Mexican manufacturers find in a high rate of exchange, but the majority of the people with whom I talked desire the restoration of bimetallism in the United States in order that stability in exchange may be added to stability in prices.

The United States has had the gold standard for twenty-three years, and the system has proved so unsatisfactory that at the last election six million and a half of voters expressed a desire for independent bimetallism, while seven millions cast their votes for candidates pledged to international bimetallism. The

gold standard has been so disastrous that even a Republican Administration is asking foreign nations to help us to get rid of it. The people of Mexico could adopt the gold standard if they desired to do so, and yet no considerable number of them wish to abandon silver.

Tenth—That Mexico is more prosperous today than every before. Her industries are increasing in number and importance. Near Orizaba is a cotton mill of immense proportions. The company operates eighteen thousand looms and seventy thousand spindles. The plant has earned more than 16 per cent. a year on the capital stock during the last five years, has been enlarged at the rate of more than 10 per cent. per annum during that time, and the company is preparing to add five hundred looms and twelve thousand spindles this year. At San Luis Potosi I found a cotton factory owned by an American. The proprietor told me that he had been enlarging his plant and found the business profitable. I went through a new cotton factory at Monterey and learned of a large mill now under construction at Guadalajara. There are a number of cotton mills also in the neighborhood of Pueblo.

The manufacture of woollen goods, the manufacture of hats, the manufacture of boots and shoes and the brewing of beer are all growing industries. The silk industry is in its infancy, but a Frenchman has planted over three million mulberry trees in the State of Guanajuato within the last few years and is much encouraged over the success thus far achieved. I vis-

ited a silk factory which he had recently opened in the suburbs of the City of Mexico.

The premium on gold has acted as a wall to keep out foreign competition and at the same time has given a substantial bounty upon exports. While I was in Mexico the gold premium varied from $1.05 to $1.15, and I shall therefore take $1.10 as an average. In 1873 the Mexican dollar commanded a premium of about three cents over our gold dollar. At that time a yard of cloth worth a dollar in the United States or Europe, when imported by Mexico, would be worth about 97 cents in Mexican money, plus transportation and tariff. Now, with gold at a premium of $1.10, a yard of cloth worth a dollar in the United States or Europe is worth $2.10 in Mexican money, plus transportation and tariff. Where the gold price has fallen one half, the Mexican price is about the same that it was in 1873.

On the other hand, those who export from Mexico have a great advantage over competitors living in gold-standard countries. For instance, a coffee raiser in Mexico, because of the rise in exchange, has fared much better than the planter who has cultivated coffee on a gold basis and who has found his income diminishing while his debts and fixed charges refused to fall. One of the gold men of my own State has laid aside his political scruples sufficiently to invest in a large tract of land near Tampico, upon which he is planting the coffee berry. He is not the only American citizen who is seeking in Mexico the prosperity for which he voted in the United States.

The cotton mills of Mexico now consume more cotton than Mexico produces, but the acreage is increasing. If, as some expect, they find it possible to produce upon Mexican soil all the cotton needed by their mills, the Mexicans will become dangerous competitors of the gold-standard countries. At present they are handicapped by having to import so large a proportion of their raw material. In reply to the argument that is sometimes made, namely, that we can protect our manufacturers by still higher duties, I contend that we can only do so by increasing the disadvantage under which American farmers now labor. The lot of our farmer is hard enough when the price of what he buys falls in the same proportion as the price of his own product, because even then his taxes, debts and other fixed charges do not fall. If, however, we maintain the price of manufactured goods by a high tariff, the burdens of the farmer will be so increased as to make his ultimate bankruptcy certain.

I might mention in this connection that I found many of our protected manufacturers selling their wares in Mexico in competition with their European rivals. At one store I found lamps and lamp chimneys made in Missouri, hammers and shovels made in Philadelphia, cutlery made in Massachusetts, also Yale locks; Disston saws and hinges made in the United States. California wines and canned fruits and Chicago canned meats find a market in Mexico. At Guanajuato is a theatre, recently completed, the structural iron of which came from the United States. At several places I saw electrical apparatus of Ameri-

an construction. In many instances an additional discount is given by American manufacturers upon exported goods.

Eleventh—That wages are not only higher on an average than ever before, but still rising. Progress or retrogression can be determined only by comparing the present with the past. The condition of the laboring classes in Mexico can be improved, but it is a fact that they are in better condition than they were in 1873, when the Mexican dollar was worth more than our gold dollar, and I believe that their condition is much better today than it would have been if Mexico had adopted the gold standard when the United States did. It is not fair to compare the wages in one country with the wages in another country without first making allowance for differences in efficiency, differences in climatic conditions, differences in habits, &c.

Even within the boundaries of our own country there are differences too great to be ignored. During President Harrison's Administration Secretary Rusk issued a document entitled, "Wages of Farm Labor in the United States" (Report No. 4, year 1892). Page 16 of this report contains a table showing that in 1892 the average wages for farm labor (without board) was $12.50 per month in South Carolina, $13.30 in North Carolina, $13.50 in Georgia and $13.75 in Alabama, while in California the wages paid were $36.50 and in the State of Washington $37.50, the average for all the states for that year being $18.60. For farm labor, with board, the wages varied from $8.40 to $25 and averaged $12.54.

The report says that white farm labor in the United States received $282 per annum; that the same labor received about $150 in Great Britain and $90 in Germany. I refer to this report beause it was issued by Republican authority and shows that under the operation of the same financial system and the same tariff system farm labor received three times as much in one part of the Union as it did in another part. When it is remembered that the wages paid in each state were ascertained by averages, it will be seen that the difference between the best-paid labor and the poorest-paid labor is still greater. The report also shows that in the United States Caucasian farm labor receives more than three times as much as the same labor receives in Germany, although both countries have a gold standard and a protetive tariff. Between 1816 and 1834 England had a gold standard and the United States had a double standard, with silver as the money in common use, and yet laboring men were better off here than in England. Turkey is one of the gold-standard nations, and Japan, until recently, coined silver at a ratio almost identical with ours, and yet the progress of Japan was so great that Mr. Cleveland commented upon it in a message during his second term. The gold-standard advocate who would consider it unfair to compare Japan and Turkey does not hesitate to blame silver for the low wages of the peons of Mexico.

In all the leading cities of Mexico can be found people from the United States, England, Germany and France—all drawn from gold-standard countries by

the advantages offered in Mexico. Few have gone from the United States to Canada, where they have the gold standard and speak the English language, but in Mexico, where an American citizen is compelled to learn an entirely new language, there are already several American colonies, and the number is constantly increasing. Some are in business for themselves, some working for wages, and they stay there, although they are at liberty to return whenever they see an opportunity to better their condition in the United States.

Twelfth—Real estate is rising in Mexico. Public and private improvements are in progress. Guadalajara one of the largest cities of the republic and surpassed by none in beauty, has recently decided to put in a complete system of sewerage and water-works. The work of constructing the sewers was let to a New Jersey contractor last month. Monterey has recently laid considerable brick pavement and the capital has nearly completed a sewerage tunnel through a mountain range. Electricity is taking the place of the old-time street lantern, the shoe is gradually supplanting the sandal and the coat is winning against the serape.

It would be unfair to give to Mexico's financial policy credit for all the progress which the country has made in the last twenty-five years. Her Government and her Government officials have contributed much to her development by giving security to life, protection to property and stimulus to education. If the advocates of the gold standard insist that her financial system has been a hindrance and that she has gone forward not because of it but in spite of it, I reply that

my observation, as well as my reason, leads me to believe that the use of silver has been of material advantage to Mexico, and I am more than ever convinced that the best interests of our own people demand the immediate restoration of the free and unlimited coinage of gold and silver at the present legal ratio of 16 to 1 without waiting for the aid or consent of any other nation.

Mexico is not strong enough to maintain the parity between the metals, but the people of the United States are. Mexico has by the use of silver avoided the fall in prices, but has suffered to a certain extent from the fluctuations in exchange. By opening our mints to the free coinage of silver we too shall escape from falling prices, and, by maintaining the parity, we shall, in addition, avoid fluctuation in exchange.

OUR SISTER REPUBLIC—MEXICO.

Second Visit.

Have you ever visited the land of the Aztecs? If not you have a treat in store for you. And even those who have been there before find themselves unable to resist the temptation to return occasionally to enjoy again the fascinating beauty of the scenery and to note the progress which the young republic to the south of us is making.

Having spent the holidays in Mexico I feel that the reader will pardon me for devoting a few columns to the subject—even more, he will expect it. Nowhere in the world can the tourist find so much variety in so limited a territory, and no country offers to the American so much of interest and of education at so small an expense. The Aztec ruins alone would repay a visit. They furnish conclusive proof of a civilization far in advance of that reached by the Indians farther north. Relics are being dug up constantly. We brought back to confound the republicans an Aztec god with gold and silver ornaments, showing that both metals were appreciated by the native Americans before the republican party was organized. There is about sixteen times as much silver as gold on the idol. While in the hot country near Tierra Blancha we dug into a mound and found numerous pieces of crockery and parts of figures.

The Santa Fe railroad makes connections at Milano, Tex., with the International, and that road passing through Austin and San Antonio connects with the Mexican National at Laredo. The Mexican National is the main line to Monterey, the most American of the Mexican cities, situated only 168 miles from the Rio Grande. Saltillo, the capital of Coahuila, one of the richest of the mining states, San Luis Potosi, one of the largest cities of the republic, Toluca, the progressive capital of the state of Mexico—the state out of which the federal district was carved—these are the main cities on this line between Monterey and the City of Mexico. The trip from the border to the capital traverses every variety of country from plain to valley and mountain. Among the principal large cities near the City of Mexico may be named Guadalajara, in the west central portion, one of the prettiest cities to be found anywhere; Aguas Callietes, named for the hot springs there; Guanajuato, which is noted for having one of the oldest silver mines, one of the handsomest theatres and the largest collection of mummies to be found on the continent, and Cuernavaca, just south of the City of Mexico, always of interest to tourists because of the private residence of Cortez, and now becoming famous as a health resort. Popocatapetl, one of the tallest peaks on this hemisphere, is seen to advantage from the Cuernavaca road.

The ride from the City of Mexico to Vera Cruz over the Mexican railroad, begins at an elevation of 7,348 feet. The ride up to Esperanza, 700 feet above,

is through the valley of Mexico, where the main crops are wheat and corn. From the car window one can draw a contrast between the old methods and the new, for some still use horses to tramp out the wheat, while a few employ the American-made thrashing machine. Here, too, the old plow closely resembling the crooked stick and drawn by oxen is fighting against the innovation of the modern plow.

In this great valley the maguey plant is also a conspicuous feature. The various fields are often separated by rows of the maguey, and where the fields are small the picture presented is an exceedingly attractive one. The maguey furnishes a variety of products—mescal, a kind of alcoholic drink used in the lower altitudes, is made from the roots of this plant, while pulque, the life-blood of the plant, the great drink of the plateau, is drawn from it at its maturity. Pulque looks like milk when dilulted with water, and, when fresh, smells like yeast. It is carried in pig skins, and carloads of it find their way into the City of Mexico every morning. It will produce a genuine case of intoxication, and the habit when once formed is as hard to cure as the whisky habit. On New Year's day we visited a hacienda in the suburbs of the City of Mexico owned by General John B. Frisby, an American, who went to Mexico several years ago and who is now identified with many large business enterprises. Our atttention was called to a dog there which had acquired a taste for pulque. He goes to the field twice a day and finds some maguey plant from which pulque is being extracted (the period of

extraction covers several weeks) and gets his dram, and then he staggers back with red eyes and sleeps off the effect of the liquor. He has ceased to be of value as a shepherd dog, but he is still useful as a horrible example.

A part of the Frisby ranch has been converted into a dairy very successfully conducted by a man from Missouri who has imported into the country a large number of Jersey, Holstein and Brown Swiss cows. The dairy is a model of cleanliness and has proved profitable to its owners.

But I digress. After leaving Esperanza the descent to Vera Cruz on the gulf, 112 miles distant, is begun. During the first seventeen miles of this trip the descent (to Maltrata) is about 2,500 feet and the scenery beautiful beyond description. From Maltrata to Orizaba the distance is only thirteen miles, but the descent is something over 1,500 feet. From Orizaba the descent is a little more gradual, the fall of 1,300 feet being distributed over sixteen miles. At Cordova one sees tropical vegetation in all its luxuriance —oranges, pine-apples, bananas, coffee, all at one time, and in the distance the snow-clad summit of Orizaba which rises nearly 17,370 feet above the level of the ocean.

From Cordova a new line called the Vera Cruz and Pacific, or as it is sometimes known, the Mason line, is just being completed to the isthmus. A branch from Tierra Blancha to Vera Cruz makes this a transcontinental line, and the improvement of the harbor at Vera Cruz will probably give it a considerable portion of the business across the isthmus. It also opens up

fertile sugar, rice and grazing lands in southern Mexico.

West of the village of Tierra Blancha, just across the Amapa river, in the state of Oaxaca, we visited a rubber tree plantation. It was projected by Alfred Bishop Mason, a Chicago business man, but the work of development has fallen to his nephews, Raymond Willis and James Trowbridge, the former a graduate of the Boston Polytechnic and the latter of Yale. These young men began about three years ago the clearing of about four hundred acres of tropical forest, so dense that it was difficult to secure any accurate idea of the lay of the land. They now have about 300,000 rubber trees growing, the oldest two and a half years old. It will be four or five years before the plantation begins to yield a return, but there is at this time every promise of success. If the experiment realizes the hopes of the young men they will deserve the reward that they will secure for they will not only make a fortune out of mother earth, but they will show others what can be accomplished in the development of this industry and thus become public benefactors. This well illustrates the difference between wealth created by the establishment of some new industry and wealth absorbed by trading or speculation.

For two years Willis and Trowbridge lived in a hut thatched with palm leaves, but last spring they began the erection of a commodious stone house, with wide and airy porches, and to this newly completed residence the former has recently brought his bride, a

Wellesley graduate, to preside over this new center of American civilization.

Near Hacienda Yale, as this new plantation is called, is a low wooded mountain range, where as I was assured by Mr. Julio Tardos, who has a cattle ranch near, parrots, monkeys and even tigers can be found in their native haunts. But this I can only report from hearsay, for I did not have time to hunt parrots or monkeys and was not disposed to infringe upon the patent of those who find relief from the cares of state in the pursuit of the larger and more ferocious wild animals.

The history of Mexico reads like a novel. Prescott's description of its conquest by Cortez could hardly be credited but for the confirmation which one finds on every hand. The toilsome march from the seashore to the table-land, the intrigues with jealous tribes, the hair-breath escapes, the explorations and the advanced Indian civilization found—all these make Prescott's volumes intensely interesting. Senor Romero has brought the history down to date in two volumes issued by Putnam & Co., of New York, books that ought to be studied by every American.

Nearly a hundred years ago the people of Mexico, part Spanish and part Indian, took up the fight for independence and, unaided, secured a separate political existence. This ended Spain's reign of three centuries beginning with the Conquest, during which time that mother country had given to Mexico a language and a religion, and had taken from Mexico about

everything valuable that could be extracted from soil or people. Following independence came an era of frequent revolutions, although they were for the most part accompanied by but little bloodshed.

Among the political leaders whose careers illustrate the ups and downs of political ambition, Santa Ana was conspicuous. Sometimes he was in authority; sometimes he was fleeing from a successful opponent. At one time he lost a limb in battle, and as it was during one of his periods of victory the severed limb was buried with great pomp and ceremony. When he again suffered defeat and his opponent came into possession of the government the buried limb was resurrected, it is said, and despitefully kicked through the streets of the city. (I have sympathized with Santa Ana sometimes when I have been buried by the republicans and then exhumed for purposes of criticism.)

The Mexican war brought the people of the United States and the people of Mexico into sharp antagonism for a little while, but the animosities engendered at that time have passed away, and there is now the most cordial feeling between the Mexicans and the Americans. This is partially due to the fact that the United States was largely instrumental in helping to rescue Mexico from European domination when, under the pretense of collecting a debt, Maximillian came over from Austria and declared himself emperor. He came while our civil war was in progress, and at a time when our government was not

in position to enforce the Monroe doctrine. As soon, however, as peace was declared at Appomatox our government began to interest itself again in the protection of American soil, and as a result of its protests the European nations that had encouraged Maximillian withdrew from his support and left him to be dealt with by the Mexican people, who executed him as a solemn warning to other ambitious European monarchs.

Jaures, who was the Mexican leader at that time, became president, and is regarded as the second great Mexican—Hidalgo, who was the first leader in the war for independence, being considered the first. Hidalgo is often called the "Mexican Washington."

The museum at the City of Mexico exhibits the state carriage of Maximillian, ornamented with silk and gold, and costing, it is said, $60,000. Near by is the very modest carriage of Jaures. The visitor marks the contrast between the splendor of an empire and the simplicity of a republic. Looking at the emperor's carriage and remembering his tragic end one recalls the lines of Gray's Elegy—

"The paths of glory lead but to the grave."

Between the Mexican war with the United States and the usurpation of Maximillian came the contest between the clergy and the laity in which the latter were successful and separated church and state so completely that while practically all of the people are members of one church the work of the church and the work of the state are not allowed to conflict. The experience of Mexico shows that if you will implant

in people the idea of self-government and teach them the inalienable rights of the individual they will apply that doctrine to all questions, and without being less devoted to their religion will obey the injunction, "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's."

The third great man produced by the Mexican republic is the present president. With the exception of one term he has been president since 1876, during which time he has shown wonderful ability, and it is doubtful if there is in the world today a chief executive of greater capacity or devotion to his people. Certainly no people have made greater relative progress than the Mexican people have made under the administration of Porfirio Diaz. Education has been promoted, law and order established, agriculture developed, commerce stimulated, and nearly every section of the country connected by railroad with the capital. While there are many able and strong men upon whom the mantle of president might worthily fall, he has been so remarkably successful and has such a hold upon all classes of people that he will doubtless remain at the head of the government as long as he lives—the people would hardly consent to his withdrawal even if he desired to lay down the responsibilities of the position.

I am sometimes asked whether I would advise people to invest in Mexico. The conditions that govern an investment are so dependent upon circumstances that no general advice can be given. In a report recently made to the American government,

Consul General Barlow of the City of Mexico gave detailed statistics to show that up to the present time American money to the amount of about $511,000,000 has been invested in the republic of Mexico. His report gives the amount invested in each town and the names of American firms doing business in Mexico. This very valuable report when published can probably be secured from members of congress if not by direct application to the state department.

The investments may be divided, generally, into five classes: railroad investments, mining investments, agricultural investments, manufacturing investments, and investments in city realty. In addition to these there have been investments in municipal lighting and water plants and there has been considerable made by Americans in contracting for the construction of railroads and the erection of public buildings.

The Mexican railroads employ Amerians for conductors and engineers almost to the exclusion of the natives. The reason given me by one of the conductors was that there is not so large a middle class to draw from there as in the United States. In Mexico the peons are not yet competent to fill these positions and the well-to-do Mexicans prefer the professions. With the increase in education, however, it is probable that the Americans will not long be able to monopolize this branch of the service.

Quite a number of Americans are interested in gold, silver and copper mines in Mexico, that country coming second as a producer of silver and having an

increased output (now about $10,000,000 annually) of gold.

A large amount of American money has been invested in agricultural lands, coffee, sugar and grazing lands having the preference. The grazing lands are to be found both in the mountains, where the conditions are similar to those that prevail on the slopes of the Rockies, or in the lowlands, where there is a prolific growth of nutritious grass.

The coffee lands are on the slopes of the mountains where the warm air from the lowlands meets the cooler air from the plateau and where there is an abundant rainfall. The sugar lands lie as a rule a little lower than the coffee lands. There is some cotton in Mexico, but not a great deal as compared with states like Texas.

Mr. J. A. Roberston of Monterey is one of the enterprising Americans who has had experience in the development of agricultural lands, besides being connected with brick-making and other manufacturing enterprises.

Judge Y. Sepulvida, formerly of California, has shown that an American can succeed there in the law, as has also Mr. Will Crittenden, formerly of Missouri.

There has been a large and constant growth in the manufacturing industry of Mexico, especially in the manufacture of cotton. There are some very large plants, one of which is located at Orizaba and others are scattered throughout the country.

Toluca, the capital of the state of Mexico, is making rapid progress in the development of manufactures

in metal, fabrics and cereals. Governor Villada, the chief executive of this state, is one of the ablest, most energetic and generous of the public men of Mexico, and has had much to do with stimulating the progress so apparent in his state. He prepared an exhibit to be shown at the Louisiana Purchase Exposition and already has a state exposition at Toluca which is well worth visiting. We spent a day there, and were surprised at the diversity of industry and at the superior workmanship manifested. Besides the industries mentioned they have fine pottery plants and paper mills, one of the mills making an excellent quality of writing paper from the leaves of the maguey plant. Here, as elsewhere in Mexico, there is an abundance of wood carving, drawn work and feather work.

Considerable money has been made by Americans by subdividing and platting acre property near the growing cities. There are many opportunities in Mexico for the man who goes there with capital and with knowledge of an industry to bring out the latent possibilities of soil and climate. There are also opportunities for those who go as skilled laborers to oversee industries in the process of development, although these opportunities lessen with the increase of education among the Mexicans, but in going one must consider the change of climate. Emigration is seldom from zone to zone, and it is not likely that any large number of Americans will care to make a permanent residence in what is known as the hot country, that is, the lowlands in the torrid zone. On the plateau

the altitude (about 7,000 feet) is such that our people can live there without suffering inconvenience. It is hardly worth one's while to go there to look for ordinary day's work, and if any one is contemplating an investment he ought to visit the country first and acquaint himself with all the circumstances that surround the industry in which he is going to invest. The cost of a trip to Mexico is so small compared with an investment of any considerable sum that a person would be foolish to send his money without first looking over the ground himself.

One has no difficulty in traveling in Mexico because he finds English spoken on the railroads and in all the leading hotels and stores. I may add a word of caution. The venders at the depots do not always follow the "one price" plan. The price when the train first stops is sometimes considerably higher than the price of the same article just as the train is leaving. We heard stories of the deceptions occasionally practiced in the preparation of merchandise for the market. In fact our boy, after having bought a pair of very pretty little birds, was somewhat disturbed by the suggestion that birds were sometimes painted for the purpose of giving variety of color. Sufficient time has elapsed, however, to show that in this case the hues were put on by nature's brush and made indelible.

I found that the people of Mexico were discussing the money question. I did not meet a single person in the republic who declared himself in favor of the gold standard, but some were alarmed at the possibility of its adoption. Statements eminating from the United

States financiers have been quoted in Mexican papers and some of the local financiers have adopted the policy that has everywhere been pursued by those who sought to make a change in the financial system against the interests of the people. These financiers, while declaring themselves averse to the gold standard, were suggesting the fixing of a new ratio between gold and silver with the idea of preventing the fluctuation of exchange.

All domestic business is transacted with silver, and when the people buy home products the question of exchange does not enter in, but the importers are embarrassed by a fall in silver. If they agree to sell to retailers at a certain price in silver their profit may be entirely extinguished by a rise in exchange. This has a tendency, however, to make them buy domestic-made goods, and the domestic manufacturers have not been heard to complain. The better informed of the Mexicans understand that a change in the ratio is only an indirect means of securing a step toward the gold standard, for the adoption of a new ratio—32 to 1 having been suggested by one local financier—would not prevent the fluctuation in exchange unless the government should undertake to exchange gold and silver coins at that ratio. If the new ratio was established and the government assumed no responsibility for the maintenance of that ratio in the market, the fluctuation would go on every day just as now, with this additional disadvantage that the change, as soon as it was recognized to be a blow at silver, would probably still further depress the price of that metal. If, on the

other hand, the government undertook to maintain the parity by exchanging gold for silver at that ratio it would have to bear the losses now borne by the import trade, but it would not have the same means of protecting itself that the importer has. The importer can protect himself by buying at home, but the government could only protect itself by collecting taxes enough to cover the loss. The danger about this experiment is that the financiers, having secured a new ratio would, if it proved unsatisfactory, as it certainly would, insist that having taken that step a further step would have to be taken. If the ratio was changed and the government did not make the metals interchangeable at that ratio the next step would be a demand that the government assume this responsibility, and if the government did assume it the expense of it would be used as an argument in favor of abandoning silver entirely.

Silver is Mexico's largest export, and her public men understand that legislation against it would not only reduce the export price and thus lessen the ability of Mexico to pay her debts abroad, but if it finally led to the discarding of a money which she produces herself, would compel her to mortgage herself to foreign financiers to secure the money necessary to do the business of the country.

Mexico's leaders, from the president and members of his cabinet down to the members of congress, governors and lesser officials, are much better informed than the outside world gives them credit for being, and they know that Mexico, a great silver producing coun-

try, could not discriminate against silver and join in the scramble for gold without immediately increasing the gap between gold and silver, a sufficient evil, and without ultimately aiding to drive other silver using nations to the yellow metal. It is likely, therefore, that Mexico will adhere to silver in spite of the inconvenience caused by a fluctuation in exchange rather than invite the greater perils that would come from an adoption of the gold standard.

It is evident from what is going on in the United States and in the great money centers that the financiers are determined to take from the people any advantage that might come from an increased production of gold. Schemes are being constantly devised for increasing the demand for gold, and the strain upon it. If the money-changers have their way the demand will not only be made equal to the supply, but enough greater than the supply to insure an era of falling prices, a condition beneficial only to the owners of money and fixed investments.

The quantitative theory of money is now generally admitted. It is a well recognized fact that a doubling of the population without any increase in the supply of wheat would raise the price of wheat, and it is also understood that a doubling of the gold using population without an increase in the supply of gold would raise the purchasing power of each ounce of gold. The director of the mint is already discouraging the production of gold, and the financiers are doing what they can to increase the demand for it. These efforts cannot be successful without serious injury to

the producing classes of the world. The people in gold-using countries ought to be grateful to Mexico for standing steadfast in her determination to keep silver a part of the currency of the world, for, to the extent that silver is used, the strain upon gold is lessened.

In conclusion I may add that Mexico furnishes a complete answer to the arguments of imperialists. In the first place, those who say that we cannot haul down the flag when once it has been raised will find that our flag once floated over Chepultepec, the rocky hill that rises abruptly from the plain of Mexico and which was for ages the citidel of the Montezumas. When the treaty of peace was signed our flag was hauled down and brought back more than 800 miles to the Rio Grande. This not only proves that the flag can be hauled down, but subsequent history shows that it was better for the flag of the Mexican republic to float over the Mexican people than that the character of our government should have been changed in order to make our flag wave over a subject race. Her officials are of the same race and blood as her citizens, and they are knit together by bonds of sympathy that are impossible when a foreign master rules a conquered people.

Sometimes the imperialist attempts to appeal to a patriotic sentiment and argues that our flag must float over the Philippines because Americans lie buried there. If he will visit Mexico he will find in the suburbs of the capital an American graveyard where the stars and stripes are raised at sunrise and lowered at

sunset. In this ground, owned by the United States the soldiers of the Mexican war, known and unknown are buried and an American citizen, an appointee of our government, sees that their graves are kept green Here on Decoration Day flowers are brought, and the sleep of these soldiers is none the less sweet because their companions in arms and their country's officials preferred to observe the principles of the Declaration of Independence rather than convert a republic into an empire.

Again, the imperialist will find in Mexico more progress made in the last thirty years than he can find in India during the hundred and fifty years of English rule. And in Mexico the imperialist will find more great men developed by the inspiring doctrines of civil liberty and inalienable rights than England has ever sent to India to conduct her colonial government.

All things considered, Mexico's experience is illustrative of the growth of democratic principles and can be studied with profit by Americans. The friendship existing today between the United States and Mexico is based upon an identity of interests and upon a growing identity of ideas. If any conflict arises between the United States and European countries in respect to the enforcement of the Monroe doctrine, Mexico is likely to be our staunchest and most valuable ally.

Value of an Ideal

A Lecture Delivered a Number of Times at Colleges, Chautauquas and in Lecture Courses.

THE VALUE OF AN IDEAL.

What is the value of an ideal? Have you ever attempted to estimate its worth? Have you ever tried to measure its value in dollars and cents? If you would know the pecuniary value of an ideal, go into the home of some man of great wealth who has an only son; go into that home when the son has gone downward in a path of dissipation until the father no longer hopes for his reform, and then ask the father what an ideal would have been worth that would have made a man out of his son instead of a wreck. He will tell you that all the money that he has or could have, he would gladly give for an ideal of life that would turn his boy's steps upward instead of downward.

An ideal is above price. It means the difference between success and failure--the difference between a noble life and a disgraceful career, and it sometimes means the difference between life and death. Have you noticed the increasing number of suicides? I speak not of those sad cases in which the reason dethroned leaves the hand no guide, but rather of those cases, increasing in number, where the person who takes his life finds nothing worth living for. When I read of one of these cases I ask myself whether it is not caused by a false ideal of life. If one measures life by what others do for him he is apt to be disappointed, for people are not likely to do as much for him as he

expects. One of the most difficult things in life is to maintain the parity between one's opinion of his own merits and the opinion that others have of him If, I repeat, a man measures life by what others do for him, he is apt to be disappointed, but if he measures life by what he does for others, there is no time for despair. If he measures life by its accumulations, these usually fall short of his expectations, but if he measures life by the contribution which he makes to the sum of human happiness, his only disappointment is in not finding time to do all that his heart prompts him to do. Whether he spends his time trying to absorb from the world, only to have the burden of life grow daily heavier, or spends his time in an effort to accomplish something of real value to the race, depends upon his ideal.

The ideal must be far enough above us to keep us looking up toward it all the time, and it must be far enough in advance of us to keep us struggling toward it to the end of life. It is a very poor ideal that one ever fully realizes, and it is a great misfortune for one to overtake his ideal, for when he does his progress stops. I was once made an honorary member of a class and asked to suggest a class motto. I suggested "Ever-Green" and some of the class did not like it. They did not like to admit that they ever had been green, not to speak of always being green. But it is a good class motto because the period of greenness is the period of growth. When we cease to be green and are entirely ripe we are ready for decay. I like to think of life as a continual progress toward

higher and better things—as a continual unfolding. There is no better description of a really noble life than that given in Holy Writ where the wise man speaks of the path of the just as "like the shining light that shineth more and more unto the perfect day."

The ideal is permanent; it does not change. Therefore it is so important that the ideal shall be a worthy one. I speak as a parent to parents, and teachers will endorse what I say, when I declare that one of the most important things in dealing with the young is to get the person to take firm hold of a high ideal. Give one food and he will hunger again; give him clothing and his clothing will wear out, but give him a high ideal and that ideal will be with him through every waking hour, lifting him to a higher plane in life and giving him a broader conception of his relations to his fellows. Plans may change; circumstances will change plans. Each one of us can testify to this. Even ambitions change, for circumstances will change ambitions. If you will pardon a reference to my own case, I have had three ambitions,—two so far back that I can scarcely remember them, and one so recent that I can hardly forget it. My first ambition was to be a Baptist preacher. When I was a small boy if any body asked me what I intended to be, I always replied "A Baptist preacher;" but my father took me one evening to see an immersion and upon reaching home I asked him if it would be necessary to go down into that pool of water in order to be a Baptist preacher. He replied that it would, and it is a tradition in our family that I never

afterwards would say that I was going to be a Baptist preacher.

My second ambition was to be a farmer and raise pumpkins, and there are doubtless a great many people who are glad that I now have a chance to realize my second ambition without having my agricultural pursuits interrupted by official cares.

My third ambition was to be a lawyer. When I was a barefoot boy I used to go to the court house and sitting upon the steps leading up to the bench upon which my father then sat I listened to the trial of cases and looked forward to the time when I would be practicing at the bar. That ambition guided me through my boyhood days and my college days. I studied law, was admitted to the bar, practiced for a while in Illinois and then located in Nebraska. In removing from Illinois to Nebraska I was influenced solely by professional reasons. I need not give you any further assurance that I did not move to Nebraska for political reasons than to say that at the time of my location in Lincoln, Nebraska was republican, the congressional district was republican, the county was republican, the city was republican, the ward was republican, and the voting precinct was republican--and to tell the truth about it, there has not been as much change in that respect as there ought to have been considering the intelligence of the people among whom I have been living.

I entered politics by accident and remained there by design. I was nominated for Congress in 1890 because it was not thought possible for a demo-

crat to be elected. I was young and new in the state. If it had been a democratic district the honor would have gone to some one older, of longer residence and more deserving. A republican paper said next morning after the convention that a confidence game had been played upon a young man from Illinois and that he had been offered as a sacrifice upon the party altar because he had not been in the state long enough to know the political complexion of the district. My location in Nebraska was due to my acquaintance with a man whom I learned to know in college and this acquaintance became more intimate because of a joke which I played upon him when we were students. Tracing it back step by step, I said one evening in Baltimore that I was elected to congress as a result of a joke that I played upon a friend in college. The gentleman who followed me said that that was nothing, that he had known men to go to congress as a result of a joke they had played upon an entire community.

My term in congress brought me into contact with the great political and economic problems now demanding solution and I have never since that time been willing to withdraw myself from their study and discussion, and I offer no apology at this time for being interested in the science of government. It is a noble science, and one to which the citizen must give his attention. I have no patience with those who feel that they are too good to take part in politics. When I find a person who thinks that he is too good to take part in politics, I find one who is

not quite good enough to deserve the blessings of a free government. Parents sometimes warn their sons to keep out of politics; mothers sometimes urge their sons to avoid politics lest they become contaminated by it. This ought not to be. It used to be the boast of the Roman matron that she could rear strong and courageous sons for the battle-field. In this age when the victories of peace are no less renowned than the victories of war, and in this country where every year brings a conflict, it ought to be the boast of American mothers that they can rear strong and courageous sons who can enter politics without contamination and purify politics rather than be corrupted by politics.

But while my plans and ambitious have been changed by circumstances, I trust that my ideals of citizenship have not changed, and that I may be permitted to share with you an ideal that will place above the holding of any office, however great, the purpose to do what I can to make this country so good that to be a private citizen in the United States will be greater than to be a king in any other nation.

The ideal dominates the life, determines the character and fixes a man's place among his fellows. I shall mention some instances that have come under my own observation and as I speak of them I am sure you will recall instances within your knowledge where the ideal has in an open and obvious way controlled the life. I have known laboring men who, working for wages, have been able to support them-

selves, acquire a library and become acquainted with the philosophers, orators and historians of the world, and many of them have laid aside enough to gratify their ambition for a college course. What enables them to resist temptation and press forward to the consummation of a high purpose? It is their ideal of life. As I have gone through the country I have found here and there young men—sometimes the sons of farmers, sometimes the sons of mechanics, sometimes the sons of merchants, sometimes the sons of professional men—young men who have one characteristic in common, namely, that they have been preparing for service. They have learned that service is the measure of greatness, and though they have not always known just what line of work they were to follow, they have been preparing themselves for service, and they will be ready when the opportunity comes.

I know a young man who came to this country when he was eighteen years of age; he came to study our institutions and learn of our form of government, and now he has returned with a determination to be helpful to his people. I watched him for five years, and I never knew a man who more patiently or perseveringly pursued a high ideal. You might have offered him all the money in the treasury to have become a citizen of the United States, but it would have been no temptation to him. He would have told you that he had a higher ideal than to stand guard over a chest of money. His desire was to be useful to his country, and I have no doubt that he will be.

I was passing through Chicago some months ago and having a few hours to spare between trains, went out to the Hull House, that splendid institution presided over by Jane Addams. I was surprised to learn of the magnitude of its work. I learned that more than five thousand names were enrolled upon the books of the association; that mothers left their babes there when they went out to work, that little children received kindergarten instruction there, that young women found a home there and young men a place where they could meet and commune free from the temptations of city life. More than twenty young men and young women give their entire time to the work of this association without compensation. Similar institutions will be found in nearly all of the larger cities and in many of the smaller ones, and in these institutions young men and young women, many of them college graduates, give a part or all of their time to gratuitous work. Why? Because somehow or somewhere they have taken hold of an ideal of life that lifts them above the sordid selfishness that surrounds them and makes them find a delight in bringing life and light and hope into homes that are dark. The same can be said of the thousands who labor in the institutions of charity, mercy and benevolence.

A few months ago it was my good fortune to spend a day in the country home of the peasant philosopher of Russia. You know something of the history of Tolstoy, how he was born in the ranks of the nobility and how with such a birth he enjoyed

every possible social distinction. At an early age he became a writer of fiction and his books have given him a fixed place among the novelists of the century. "He sounded all the depths and shoals of honor" in so far as honor could be derived from society or from literature, and yet at the age of forty-eight life seemed so vain and empty to him that he would fain have terminated his existence. They showed me a ring in the ceiling of a room in his house from which he had planned to hang himself. And what deterred him? A change came in his ideals. He was born again, he became a new creature, and for more than twenty-eight years, clad in the garb of a peasant and living the simple life of a peasant, he has been preaching unto all the world a philosophy that rests upon the doctrine "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and thy neighbor as thyself." There is scarcely a civilized community in all the world where the name of Tolstoy is not known and where his influence has not been felt. He has made such an impression upon the heart of Russia and the world that while some of his books are refused publication in Russia and denied importation from abroad, while people are prohibited from circulating some of the things that he writes, yet with a million men under arms the government does not lay its hands upon Tolstoy.

Let me add another illustration of a complete change in the ideal. In college I became acquainted with a student fourteen years my senior, and learned the story of his life. For some years he was a tramp,

going from place to place without fixed purpose or habitation. One night he went by accident into a place where a revival was in progress, and he was not only converted but he decided to be a minister. I watched him as he worked his way through college, doing chores to earn his board and lodging, working on Saturdays in a store, and during the summer months at anything he could find to do. I watched him as he worked his way through theological seminary and then I watched him as he preached the Gospel until he died, and I never knew a man more consecrated to a high purpose. The change came in his life as in the twinkling of an eye. Could anything be more marvelous?

Some have rejected the Christian religion because they could not understand its mysteries and its miracles. I passed through a period of skepticism when I was in college, but I have seen outside of the Bible so many things more marvelous than anything recorded in Holy Writ that its mysteries no longer disturb me. Is it impossible that a multitude could have been fed with a few loaves and fishes? Every spring when the sun melts the ice and drives away the snow, vegetation springs up and not a few thousand but hundreds of millions are fed with the products of the soil. And how many of those who eat are satisfied understand the chemistry of the vegetable? I plant some seed myself in the springtime,—lettuce seed, melon seed, various kinds of seed. The earth grows warm beneath the rays of the sun; the seeds burst forth and send their little roots down into the ground

and their tiny leaves up into the air. And, drawing their sustenance from the same soil and the same atmosphere, these vegetables finally mature and when I go to gather them I find that they differ in size, in shape, in flavor, in coloring, in everything. But I like them and eat them although I do not understand the mystery of their growth. Did you ever raise a radish? You put a small black seed into the black soil and in a little while you return to the garden and find the full grown radish. The top is green, the body white and almost transparent and the skin a delicate red or pink. What mysterious power reaches out and gathers from the ground the particles which give it form and size and flavor? Whose is the invisible brush that transfer to the root, growing in darkness, the hues of the summer sunset? If we were to refuse to eat anything until we could understand the mystery of its creation we would die of starvation—but mystery, it seems, never bothers us in the dining room, it is only in the church that it causes us to hesitate.

The mystery of life itself has never been revealed to us. Six thousand years of human history, and yet who understands the mystery of his own being? I speak to you from this platform; we have our thoughts, we have our hopes, we have our fears, and yet we know that in a moment a change may come over any one of us that will convert a living, breathing human being into a mass of lifeless clay. We walk all the way beneath the shadow of death, and yet the splendid civilization which we see about us is the product of

men and women who do not understand the mystery of their own lives.

I have been reading a book recently on materialism and I have been interested in the attempt of the author to drive God out of the universe. He searches for Him with a microscope, and because he cannot find Him with a microscope, he declares that he is too small to see; then he searches for Him with a telescope, and because he cannot see Him among the stars or beyond, he declares that there is no God,—that matter and force alone are eternal, and that force acting on matter has produced the clod, the grass that grows upon the clod, the beast that feeds upon the grass, and man, the climax of created things. I have tried to follow his reasoning and have made up my mind that it requires more faith to accept the scientific demonstrations of materialism than to accept any religion of which I have known. As I tried to follow his syllogisms I was reminded of the reasoning of a man who conceived the idea that a grasshopper heard through its legs. But he would not accept it without demonstration, so he took a grasshopper, put it on a board and knocked on the board. The grasshopper jumped, and this he regarded as evidence that the sound traveled along the board till it reached the grasshoppers legs and then went up through the legs to the center of life. But he was not willing to accept it upon affirmative proof alone; he insisted upon proving it negatively, so he pulled the legs off the grasshopper and put it on the board and rapped again. As the grasshopper did not jump, he was convinced that it heard through its legs.

I say I was reminded of the grasshopper scientist when I read the arguments employed to prove that there is no God, no spiritual life. There is nothing in materialism to explain the change which takes place in a human heart when a man begins to hate the things he loved and to love the things he hated—nothing in materialism to explain the marvellous transformation that takes place in a human being who, before the change, would have sacrificed a world to his own advancement but who after the change would give his life for a principle and esteem it a privilege to sacrifice for his convictions. In the journey from the cradle to the grave we encounter nothing so marvellous as the change in the ideals that works a revolution in the life itself.

It makes a great deal of difference to the individual what his ideal is, and it also makes a difference to those about him. If you have a man working for you, it makes a great deal of difference to you whether he is watching you all the time to see that you give him the best possible pay for his work, or watching himself a little to see that he gives you the best possible work for his pay. And we are all working for somebody. Instead of working by the day and receiving our pay at night, or instead of working by the month and receiving our pay at the end of the month, we may be in independent business and receiving a compensation fixed by competition, but if we are not living a life of idleness we must be working for somebody, and it makes a great deal of difference to society whether

we are simply bent upon absorbing as much as possible from the world, or are trying to give a dollar's worth of service for a dollar's worth of pay. There are some who regard it as a discreditable thing to engage in productive labor. There are places where they count with pride the number of generations between themselves and honest toil. If I can leave but one thought with the young men who honor me by their presence on this occasion, let it be this thought—that we must all have food and clothing and shelter, and must either earn these things or have them given to us, and any self-respecting young man ought to be ashamed to sponge upon the world for his living and not render unto the world valuable service in return.

Sometimes you meet a man who boasts that he is "self-made," that he did it all himself, that he owes no man anything. Well, a little of the big-head may be excusable. I remember hearing my father say once that if a man had the big head you could whittle it down, but that if he had the little head there was no hope for him. It is necessary that a person should have confidence in his ability to do things, or he will not undertake them. But when I hear of a man boasting of his independence I feel like cross-examining him. We owe a great deal to environment. I was going along by the side of the court house in Chicago one wintery day and saw some little boys gambling with their pennies in a warm corner by the building. A question arose in my mind, namely, why these little fellows were born and reared amid an environment that gave them no higher ideals of life, while so

many in Chicago and in the country at large were born amid an environment that gave them higher ideals and larger conceptions of life? The scene made an impression upon my memory, and when I hear a man boasting that he owes no one anything, I feel like asking him whether he has paid back the debt he owes to father and mother, teacher and patriarch? Whether he has paid back the debt he owes to the patriots who with blood and sacrifice purchased the liberties which we now enjoy. We have received so much from the generations past and from those about us that instead of boasting of what we have done we ought to learn humility and be content if at the end of life we can look back over the years and be assured that we have given to the world a service equal in value to that which we have received.

There is abroad in the land a speculative spirit that is doing much harm. Instead of trying to earn a living, young men are bent on making a fortune. Not content with the slow accumulations of honest toil, they are seeking some short cut to riches, and are not always scrupulous about the means employed. The "get-rich-quick" schemes that spring up and swindle the public until they are discovered and driven out, prey upon the speculative spirit and find all their victims among those who are trying to get something for nothing. If a lottery were permitted to open up in this town and offered a thousand dollar prize, and sold chances at a dollar apiece, you would be surprised to find how many would send around to the back door and purchase a ticket.

What we need today is an ideal of life that will make people as anxious to render full service as they are to draw full pay—an ideal that will make them measure life by what they bestow upon their fellows not by what they receive.

Not only must the individual have an ideal, but we must have ideals as groups of individuals and in every department of life. We have our domestic ideals. Whether a marriage is happy or not depends not so much upon the size of the house or the amount of the income, as upon the ideals with which the parties enter marriage. If two people contract marriage like some people trade horses—each one trying to get the better of the bargain—it is not certain that the marriage will be a happy one. In fact, the man who cheats in a horse trade has at least one advantage over the man who cheats in matrimony. The man who cheats in a horse trade may console himself with the thought that he will never see again the person whom he has cheated. Not so fortunate is the man who cheats in marriage. He not only sees daily the person whom he has cheated, but he is sometimes reminded of it—and it is just as bad if the cheating is done by the other side. Americans sometimes have to blush when they read of the international marriages so much discussed in the papers. I speak not now of those cases where love leaps across the ocean and binds two hearts—there are such cases and they are worthy of a blessing. But I speak rather of those commercial transactions which are by courtesy called marriages, where some young woman in this country trades a

fortune that she never earned to a broken down prince of another country for a title that he never earned, and they call it a fair exchange. I have sometimes thought that it might be worth while to establish papers in the centers of the old world to tell the people of our real marriages, so that they would not misunderstand us.

There is an American ideal of domestic life. When two persons, drawn together by the indissoluble ties of love, enter marriage, each one contributing a full part and both ready to share life's struggles and trials as well as its victories and its joys—when these, mutually helpful and mutually forbearing, start out to build an American home it ought to be the fittest earthly type of heaven.

In business it is necesary to have an ideal. It is as impossible to build a business without an ideal as it is to build a house without a plan. Some think that competition is so sharp now that it is impossible to be strictly honest in business; some think that it is necessary to recommend a thing, not as it is, but as the customer wants it to be. There never was a time when it was more necessary than it is today that business should be built upon a foundation of absolute integrity.

In the professions, also, an ideal is necessary. Take the medical profession for illustration. It is proper that the physician should collect money from his patients for he must live while he helps others to live, but the physicians who have written their names high upon the scroll of fame have had a higher ideal than

the making of money. They have had a passion for the study of their profession; they have searched diligently for the hidden causes of disease and the remedies therefore and they have found more delight in giving to the world some discovery of benefit to the race, than they have found in all of the money that they have collected from their patients.

And the lawyer; has he ideals? Yes. I suppose the ideals of lawyers vary as much as the ideals in any other profession. I have known lawyers to boast of securing the acquittal of men whom they knew to be guilty; I have heard them boast of having secured for their clients what they knew their clients did not deserve. I do not understand how a lawyer can so boast. He is an officer of the court and as such he is sworn to assist in the administration of justice. When he has helped his client to secure all that is justly due him he has done his full duty as a lawyer, and if he goes beyond that he goes at his own peril. Show me a lawyer who has spent a lifetime trying to obliterate the line between right and wrong and I will show you a man whose character has grown weaker year by year, and whose advice is at last of no value to a client, because he will have lost the power to discriminate between right and wrong. Show me, on the other hand, a lawyer who has spent a lifetime in the search for truth, determined to follow where it leads, and I will show you a man whose character has grown stronger year by year and whose advice is of constantly increasing value because the power to discern the truth grows with the honest search for truth.

Then, too, a lawyer's influence with the judge depends largely upon his reputation for honesty. Of course a lawyer can fool a judge a few times and lead him into a hole, but after awhile the judge learns to know the lawyer, and then he cannot follow the lawyer's arguments because he is looking for the hole all the time, which he knows is somewhere and which he is trying to avoid. I need not remind you that nothing is so valuable to a jury lawyer as a reputation that will make the jurors believe that he will not under any circumstances misstate a proposition of law or of evidence. And so I might take up each occupation, calling and profession, and show that the ideal controls the life, determines the character and establishes a man's place among his fellows.

But let me speak of the ideals of a larger group. What of our political ideals? The party as well as the individual must have its ideals, and we are far enough from the election to admit that there is room in all the parties for the raising of the party ideal. How can a person most aid his party? Let us suppose that one is passionately devoted to his party and anxious to render it the maximum of service; how can he render this service? By raising the ideal of his party. If a young man asks me how he can make a fortune in a day, I cannot tell him. If he asks how he can become rich in a year, I know not what to answer him, but I can tell him that if he will locate in any community and for twenty-five years live an honest life, an industrious life, a useful life, he will make friends and fasten them to him with hooks of steel; he will make his impress upon the community

and the chances are many to one that before the quarter of a century has elapsed his fellows will call upon him to act for them and to represent them in important matters.

And so if you ask me how we can win an election this year, I do not know. If you ask me how we can insure a victory four years from now, I cannot tell, but I do know that the party which has the highest ideals and that strives most earnestly to realize its ideals will ultimately dominate this country and make its impress upon the history of the nation. As it is more important that the young man shall know how to build character and win a permanent success than that he shall know how to become rich in a day, so it is more important that we shall know how to contribute to the permanent influence of a party than it is that we be able to win a temporary victory or distribute the spoils of office after a successful campaign.

The country is suffering today from a demoralization of its ideals. Instead of measuring people by the manhood or womanhood they manifest, we are too prone to measure them by the amount of money they possess, and this demoralization has naturally and necessarily extended to politics. Instead of asking "Is it right?" we are tempted to ask "Will it pay?" and "Will it win?" As a result the public conscience is becoming seared and the public service debauched. We find corruption in elections and corruption in office. Men sell their votes, councilmen sell their influence, while state legislators and federal representatives turn the government from its legitimate channels

and make it a private asset in business. It is said that in some precincts in Delaware a majority of the voters have been paid for their votes. Governor Garvin of Rhode Island calls attention to the corruption in that state; there is corruption in Connecticut, in New Jersey and in Pennsylvania. I learned of an instance in New York where a farmer with a quarter-section of land demanded a dollar and a half for his vote, and I learned of another instance in West Virginia where a man came in fourteen miles from the country the day before election to notify the committee that he would not vote the next day unless he received a dollar. In some places I found that democrats were imitating republican methods. They excused it by saying that they were fighting the Devil with fire. This is no excuse. It is poor policy to fight the devil with fire. He knows more about fire than you do and does not have to pay so much for fuel. I was assured that the democrats did not buy votes exactly like the republicans. I was assured that the democrats only bought votes when they found some democrat who was being tempted more than he could bear, and that they only used money to fortify the virtue of the democrat for fear he might yield to temptation and become vicious.

How are we to stop this corruption? Not by going into the market and bidding against our opponents, but by placing against money something stronger than money. And what is stronger than money? A conscience is stronger than money. A conscience that will enable a man to stand by a stake and smile while the flames consume him is stronger than money, and

we must appeal to the conscience—not to a democratic conscience or to a republican conscience, but to an American conscience and to a Christian conscience and place this awakened conscience against the onflowing tide of corruption in the United States.

We must have parties in this country. Jefferson said that there were naturally two parties in every country—a democratic party and an aristocratic party (and he did not use the word "democratic" in a partisan sense, for at that time the party which we now call democratic was called the republican party). Jefferson said that a democratic party would naturally draw to itself those who believe in the people and trust them, while an aristocratic party would naturally draw to itself those who do not believe in or trust the people. Jefferson was right. Go into any country in Europe, and you will find a party of some name that is trying to increase the participation of the people in the government, and you will also find a party of some name which is obstructing every step toward popular government. We have the same difference in this country, but the democratic spirit is broader here than any party. Wherever the question has been clearly presented and on the one side there was an attempt to carry the government nearer to the people and on the other an effort to carry the government further from the people, popular government has always won. Let me illustrate. The Australian ballot is intended to protect the citizen in his right to vote, and thus give effect to the real wishes of the people, and when this reform was proposed it swept the coun-

try without regard to the party in power in the various states. Take the demand for the election of senators by the people; upon what does it rest? Upon the belief that the people have the right to and the capacity for self-government. The sentiment in favor of this reform has grown until a resolution proposing a constitutional amendment has passed the Lower House of congress four times—twice when the house was democratic and twice when it was republican. This reform is sure to come, because the people believe in self-government, and they will in time insist upon making the government conform to their belief.

The initiative and referendum involve the same principles. The initiative describes the process by which the people compel the submission of a question upon which they desire to vote, and the referendum describes the process by which they act upon a question submitted. In each new charter the power of the people is increased. Limitations are placed upon legislative power and new questions are submitted to a popular vote. It is now necessary almost everywhere to submit to the people of a city the question of issuing bonds. The movement in favor of submitting franchises also is an irresistible one, and the time will come when it will be impossible for councilmen to sell franchises in return for money paid to themselves.

Switzerland is probably the most democratic country in the world. There the initiative and referendum are employed by both the federal government and by the local subdivisions, and the government is

completely responsive to the will of the people. In order to formulate a party ideal, we must have a theory of government as a basis, and in this country the fundamental principle of government is that the people have a right to have what they want in legislation. I made this statement in a lecture in Michigan and one of the audience took issue with me. He said that I ought to amend the statement and say that the people have a right to have what they want provided they want what is right. I asked him who would decide the question of right? And he had to admit that at last the decision lay with the people. Constitutions place limitations upon legislatures and upon the people themselves, but the constitutions are made by the people and can be changed by the people. The only escape from the rule of the majority is the rule of the minority, and if a majority make mistakes, would not a minority also? But mistakes made by a majority will be corrected when they are discovered, while mistakes made by a minority in power may not be corrected if the mistake is pecuniarily advantageous to those in power. The revolutions that have from time to time shaken the world have been caused largely by the refusal of the minority to correct mistakes beneficial to those who make the mistakes but injurious to the people at large. Bearing in mind the right of the people to deliberately fix the means by which they will express themselves, and their right to place limitations upon themselves, so that they cannot act hastily or under a sudden impulse, I repeat that the people have a right to have what they want

in legislation. If they want a high tariff, they have a right to it; if they want a low tariff, they have a right to that. They have a right to make tariff laws and to repeal them. They have a right to the gold standard if they want it, and they have a right to the double standard if they desire that, or if they prefer they can demonetize both gold and silver and substitute some other kind of money. If gold and silver furnish too much money, they can strike down one; if the remaining metal still furnishes too much they can strike that down and substitute something scarcer. Ever since the discovery of radium, of which it is said there are but two pounds in the world, I have been fearful that an attempt would be made to make it the standard money of the country. But if the people decide to demonetize both gold and silver and substitute radium I will still insist that they have a right to do it. And then if they then decide to give Morgan one pound and Rockefeller the other, I shall still stand with the people and watch Rockefeller and Morgan while they use the money.

The people have a right to have trusts if they want them. They have a right to have one trust, a hundred trusts or a thousand, and they also have a right to kill every private monopoly.

If the people have a right to have what they want, then the dutyof the party is plain. It is to present to the people a code of principles and policies to be acted upon by them. Who can defend the practicing of deception upon the voters? Who can justify the winning of a victory by false pretense? Who can excuse a fraud upon the people? No one can defend a party ideal that

does not require honesty in party contests. The policy of the party must be determined by the voters of the party, and he must have a low conception of political ethics who would seek by stealth to give to the minority of the party the authority that belongs to the majority. And so he must have a low conception of political ethics who would seek to secure for a minority of the people the authority that belongs to a majority. I want my party to write an honest platform, dealing candidly with the questions at issue; I want it to nominate a ticket composed of men who conscientiously believe in the principles of the party as ennunciated, and then I want the party to announce to the country "These are our principles; these are our candidates. Elect them and they will carry out the principles for which they stand; they will not under any circumstances betray the trust committed to their keeping."

This is the ideal that the democratic party ought to have and it is an ideal high enough for every party.

There is this difference between the ideal and other things of value, namely, that an ideal cannot be patented or copyrighted. We often see things that we cannot hope to possess, but there is no ideal however high that cannot be ours if we desire it. The highest ideal of human life that this world has ever known was that furnished by the life of the Man of Gallilee. But it was an ideal within the comprehension of the fisherman of his day, and the Bible says of Him that the common people heard Him gladly. So with a high party ideal. It can be comprehended by all the

members of the party, and it can be adopted by every party. If we can fight out political battles upon this plane there is no humiliation about defeat. I have passed through two presidential campaigns, and many have rejoiced over my defeats, but if events prove that my defeats have been good for this country, I shall rejoice over them myself more than any opponent has rejoiced. And when I say this I am not unselfish, for it is better for me that my political opponents should bring good to my country than that I should by any mistake of mine bring evil. Senator Hill of Georgia once said:

"Who saves his country saves himself and all things saved do bless him; who lets his country die, lets all things die, dies himself ignobly and all things dying curse him."

This is my country. I want a good government while I live; I want to leave a good government as a priceless legacy to my children and if my political opponents can devise for my country, my children and myself a better government than I can devise, they are not my enemies, but my friends.

Not only must the party have an ideal, but the nation must also have its ideal, and it is the ideal of this nation that has made it known throughout the world. You will find people in foreign lands who do not know our population or the number of acres under our flag. You will find people who do not know how many cattle we raise or how much corn or cotton we export, but you will not find people anywhere who have not some conception of the nation's ideal.

This ideal has been a light shining out unto all the world and its rays have illumined the shores of every land. We have boasted of this ideal in the past, and it must not be lowered now. We followed this ideal in dealing with Cuba. It was my good fortune to be in Cuba on the day when the formal transfer took place, and I never was more proud of my nation in my life than I was on the 20th day of May, 1902, when this great republic rose superior to a great temptation, recognized the inalienable rights of the people of Cuba and secured to them the fruits of a victory for which they had struggled and sacrificed for more than a generation. We hauled down the flag, it is true, and in its place they raised the flag of the Cuban republic, but when we lowered the flag we raised it higher than it ever had been before, and when we brought it away we left it enshrined in the hearts of a grateful people.

Is it the desire of any simply to make our flag feared? Let us rather make it loved by every human being. Instead of having people bow before it, let us have them turn their faces toward it and thank God that there is one flag that stands for human rights and for the doctrine of self-government everywhere. There are some who say that we must now have the largest navy in the world in order to terrorize other nations, and make them respect us. But if we make our navy the largest in the world, other nations will increase their navies because we have increased ours, and then we will have to increase ours again, because they will have increased theirs, and they will

have to increase theirs again because we have increased ours—and there is no limit to this rivalry, but the limit of the power of the people to bear the burdens of taxation. There is a better, a safer and a less expensive plan. Instead of trying to make our navy the largest in the world, let us try to make our government the best government on earth. Instead of trying to make our flag float everywhere, let us make it stand for justice wherever it floats—for justice between man and man, for justice between nation and nation, and for humanity always. And then the people of the world will learn to know and to revere that flag, because it will be their protection as well as ours. And then if any king raises his hand against our flag the oppressed people of his own land will rise up and say to him "Hands off! That flag stands for our rights as well as the rights of the American people." It is possible to make our flag represent such an ideal. We shall not fulfill our great mission, we shall not live up to our high duty unless we present to the world the highest ideals in individual life, in domestic life, in business life, in professional life, in politcal life—and the highest national ideal that the world has ever known.

A Conquering Nation

A lecture delivered a number of times at colleges, chautauques, and in lecture courses

A CONQUERING NATION.

During national campaigns it is difficult to reach the sober thought of the public. When the platforms are adopted and the tickets nominated, the people get set in their ways and it is difficult to make an impression upon them. It is said that an old colored servant of Andrew Jackson, who survived his master many years, was asked if he thought Andrew Jackson went to heaven. He answered, "If he set his head that way, he did." During campaigns, I repeat, people get their heads set and are not open to conviction. I am glad, therefore, to speak to you between campaigns. I desire to talk to you about questions of government, but I want to deal with those questions in such a fundamental way as not to offend political opponents.

I am convinced that we have all given relatively too much time to the consideration of the pecuniary features of public questions, and too little time to the consideration of the moral principles, which underlie all questions. In discussing the tariff question the advocates of a high tariff have tried to show that protection puts money into the pockets of the people, and the advocates of a low tariff have tried to show that protection takes money out of the pockets of the people—but it has all been about money. In the discussion of the money question we have compared dollars and systems of dollars. When we have discussed the trust question we have generally considered the pe-

cuniary benefit of private monopolies and the pecuniary objections to them. Even the question of imperialism has been dragged down into the mire and cents. Instead of trying to ascertain the moral principle involved, we have spent too much time trying to find out whether a colonial policy would pay.

Let me then invite your attention to certain moral principles which I believe to be intimately connected with our government.

In looking for a subject for a non-partisan address some months ago, I stumbled across the word "Civilization." The more I thought of it the more it grew upon me. Have you ever tried to write a definition of civilization? Buckle described civilization as measured by the mastery of the human mind over the forces of nature. It surprised me to find that he left out of consideration the moral element and I was still more surprised to find that he not only intentionally omitted the moral element, but defended the omission by declaring that substantially the same moral principles had been accepted in all ages, and from this proposition he argued that we must measure the differences between peoples and races by the differences in their mental development. I am compelled to dissent from Buckle, and I believe that his error consists largely in this,—that he has measured people by the moral principles accepted rather than by the moral principles exemplified in life. If you will take the worst man you know and place him beside the best man you know, you will find that both admit the correctness of the great moral principles that underlie

society. Wherein do they differ, then? One lives his moral principles, and you call him an upright man, the other suspends them in hours of temptation, and you punish him as a criminal. My investigation has led me to believe that the moral element is not only important but paramount in government, and that the decay of nations has been due to a decay in the moral element. A government is strong in proportion as it rests upon justice; it becomes weak in proportion as injustice is substituted for justice. Sometimes we hear it said that nations, like invididuals, must necessarily decay. Some argue that, because the individual is born, grows strong, passes through a period of maturity and at last becomes infirm and dies, a nation composed of individuals must pass through the same stages and at last reach the same end. I deny that there is any analogy between the individual and the nation that makes it necessary for the nation to die. The individual must die, for death is a part of the law of his being, but nations, while at a given time composed of individuals, are in their history composed of generations. As one generation passes off the stage, another comes on, and, unless there is some reason why a future generation should be weaker or worse than this there is no reason why this nation should ever be weaker or worse than it is now. I assert, therefore, that there is no necessary reason why this nation should not be greater and more glorious a thousand years from now than it is now. If the time ever comes when this nation shall turn downward and at last by its wreck and ruin furnish a warning to the

nations that come after it, it will be because of moral decay among the people and in our government.

A definition ought to include every essential element of the thing defined and exclude everything else, and I have found no definition of civilization which seems to fill this requirement. I suggest, therefore, for your consideration the following definition: Civilization is the harmonious development of the human race, physically, mentally and morally. The word, socially, might be added, and yet it is difficult to conceive of an harmonious mental and moral development that does not include a social development, for a proper heart development makes one recognize the ties that bind him to his fellows, and a proper mental development leads him to employ the wisest means for the carrying on of the joint work of society.

I have taken as my subject on this occasion, "A Conquering Nation" because I am anxious that this nation shall grow in strength and influence among the nations. I am anxious that it shall be a great nation, a conquering nation. I am anxious that it shall overcome the world. But what is the measure of national greatness? I know of no way of measuring a nation except to apply to it the same moral principles that we apply to an individual. I will go further than that; I know of no moral principle that can be applied to one human being that cannot be applied—aye, that must not be applied—to eighty millions of human beings acting together as a nation. One of the great dangers of the present day is the tendency to limit and amend and qualify great moral principles. Let me

illustrate. There is a commandment which reads: "Thou shalt not steal." That is the way we learned it. It is simple and plain and strong, but it is being amended to read "Thou shalt not steal—on a small scale." If the larceny is on a large scale it is different. I am not revealing any secrets when I tell you that as a rule it is safer in this country to steal a million dollars than it is to steal a hundred dollars.

The man who steals a hundred dollars is a common ordinary thief, but if a man steals a million we are so amazed at his genius that we sometimes forget to punish his rascality. If a man steals a hundred dollars he is sure to go to the penitentiary, but if he steals a million it is not so certain. Nor is this the only commandment that is being amended. There is a commandment against covetousness and we all know that it is a sin for a man to covet a thing of small value, but if a nation covets the territory of another nation and the government of other people, it is sometimes called patriotism and justified as providential. There is still another commandment that reads, "Thou shalt not kill." You cannot mistake its meaning; but it is being amended to read that you must not kill a man unless he has something you want. Or if still observed as between individuals, there are some who insist that eighty millions of people may join together and kill eight millions in the Orient if they can extend the nation's trade thereby. I repeat that this tendency to amend and limit and qualify great moral principles is a dangerous tendency. There is a lesson that we ought to learn,—a lesson founded upon Holy Writ and

taught by history, namely, that a nation, no matter how large it may be, cannot do wrong with impunity. It is as true of a nation as it is of an individual that the harvest is according to the sowing. Be not deceived because the punishment does not follow immediately upon the heels of the crime. A man may at fifty pay the penalty for sins committed at twenty-five; so a nation may pay the penalty for sins committed a decade or a century before. If a nation sows the wind it will reap the whirlwind, though many seedtimes and harvests may pass between the sowing and the reaping. If your child shows a tendency to depart from the path of recitude, you do not wait for him to commit some great crime before you correct him; you show him at once the tendency of his act. And so if we love our country and are anxious to do our duty as citizens, we must not wait until there is some flagrant abuse of government, or until an evil is fully developed. We must watch the tendency of the principles at work. Every evil policy will bring forth evil fruit, and the punishment is sure to come.

We must measure a nation's greatness as we would measure the greatness of an individual, and what is the measure of individual greatness? It is a laudable ambition for your boy or mine to aspire to become the greatest man in the state, the nation or the world, but he must understand the true measure of greatness, and to find that measure we have to go back to the Bible. I am not ashamed to quote from the Bible, for I have never found any other book which contains so much of truth, nor have I found any other book in which truth was so well expressed. You will

remember that the disciples quarreled among themselves as to which should be the greatest in the kingdom of heaven, and when they brought the question to the Master, he said: "Let him who would be chiefest among you be the servant of all." Service is the measure of greatness. It always has been true; it is true today; it always will be true that he is greatest who does the most good. But if there is any one here who is not willing to accept Bible authority, I am glad that I can fortify this scriptural quotation with the testimony of the greatest of heathen philosophers. In the conversations of Socrates I find that he quotes from another Greek the story of the choice of Hercules. The story runs like this: When Hercules was a young man he went out to meditate upon his course in life, and as he meditated two maidens appeared to him. One, in gaudy attire, said: "Hercules, if you will follow the path that I point out, your life will be a life of ease. You will have no troubles, no trials, no hardships; your whole time will be occupied in the selection of food to eat and wine to drink." Hercules said to her: "What is your name?" and she replied "My name is Pleasure, but my enemies call me vice." The other maiden said: "Hercules, I will not deceive you. If you follow the path that I point out, your life will be full of hardships, full of trials, full of great undertakings, but, Hercules, it is the path that leads to immortality. If you would have people love you, you must serve them; if you would have your state honor you, you must confer some great benefit upon your state."

Thus, whether we rely upon history sacred or profane, we find that service is the measure of greatness.

Not only is service the measure of greatness, but it is the measure of happiness as well. We are happy, not in proportion as people do something for us, but in proportion as we do something for others. I appeal to your own experiences for verification. Look back over your lives; what days are brightest? The days remembered because of what others have done for you? No, the days that are brightest—and they will grow brighter with the years—are the days which are glorified by some generous contribution to the welfare of the world.

If I were able to put on canvas my conception of a happy and a successful life, I would represent it as a living spring, pouring forth constantly of that which refreshes and invigorates and I would represent an unhappy and unsuccessful life as a stagnant pool receiving contributions from all the land around and giving forth nothing in return. It is sound philosophy as well as good religion to say that a life is happy in proportion as it abounds in helpfulness, not in proportion as it absorbs from the world. It is fortunate that this is true, because if one were happy in proportion as people did something for him, his happiness would be in the keeping of others, but if his happiness depends upon what he does for others, it is in his own keeping, and it is his own fault if he is not happy.

Then, too, people remember better that which they do for others than they do that which others do for them. If you doubt it, go into politics. You will find

that if you do something for a man he may forget it, but if he does something for you, he will always remember it. On the evening of the day when I was first elected to congress, we gathered at the office of the chairman of the committee to receive the returns. And a gentleman came up to me and assured me that he himself had written my name on more than two hundred ballots in his voting precinct. I was amazed at his industry; it was an extraordinary amount of work for one man to do and you can imagine my mortification when the returns came in from that precinct and I found that I had not only failed to receive any votes upon my own merits, but that I had apparently not been able to hold all he secured for me, because I had less votes in the precinct than he thought he had secured. Yet I have no doubt that the man intended to be truthful, and told only what he thought he had done, but the explanation is simple. When you look at what you do for others you see all that you do, and more too; and the longer you look the more you see. Thus the pleasure that you derive from remembering it increases with the years. But when you look at what others do for you, you not only do not see all that they do, but the longer you look the less you see. The pleasure, therefore, that you derive from remembering what others do for you is a decreasing pleasure.

I may add, also, that we love people in proportion as we serve them. I remember a little play put upon the stage by the senior class of the high school of our city. There were several characters in the play, among

them a man, his wife and their daughter. To make the play natural, the daughter had a beau, and to make it entirely lifelike, she had two beaus, and these beaus were in constant rivalry for the hand of the girl. It so happened that the father, mother and daughter took a trip to Switzerland and it also happened that on the day of their arrival the two young men also happened to arrive in Switzerland, and the contest was continued. Soon after the arrival of the group the old man got into a dangerous place on a mountainside and one of the young men saved his life. Not long after that the other young man was in danger, and the old man saved his life. Now what was the result? The wife ever and anon reminded her husband how grateful he should be to the young man who had saved his life, but while the husband got tired of hearing of this, he never got tired of telling how much he had done for the other young man. Thus while the wife out of gratitude favored the young man who had saved her husband's life, the father formed an attachment for the young man whose life he had saved. This is not strange; the Bible explains it when it says: "Where your treasures are, there will your heart be also." If you bestow your time, your interest or your goods upon one, your affections will follow the gift. The more you do for him, the more you will love him. If you want to love all the world, I do not know of any better way to bring yourself into this attitude than to try to do something for all the world. Why is it that there is nothing on earth like a mother's love? It is because there is no service under heaven like that which the mother renders to her child.

But a great many people who understand that service measures greatness and are anxious to win greatness by service have mistaken the method of service. I have become so interested in this subect that I have carefully examined to see in how many different ways people have tried to be useful, and I have been surprised to find that in all the history of the human race, but two methods have been employed. The first is the forcible method, and it has been employed most. A man has an idea which he thinks is good; he tells it to his neighbors and they do not like it. He thinks that it would be much better for them if they would like it, and so he starts out with a club to make them accept his idea. But the trouble about this rule is that it works both ways. If a man starts out with a club to make his neighbors think as he does, the chances are—well, at least sixteen-to-one —that they will employ a club in the effort to make him think as they do, and then they will quarrel and fight. They will spend so much time in trying to coerce each other, that they will have no time left to do each other good. There is just one other method, and it is the Bible method: "Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good." There is no other method known under Heaven or among men whereby we can overcome evil except to substitute something better for it. I am not much of a farmer; I have been given more credit for my farming than I deserve, and my little farm has received more advertising than it is entitled to, but I have farmed enough to know that if you cut down weeds they will grow again. You may cut them down as often as you like, but they will

still spring up. But if you will plant something that has more vitality than the weeds you will not only get rid of the constant cutting, but you will receive the benefit of the crop. So I believe that the best service that one can render a fellow being is to give him a high ideal in the place of a low one. Any other help is temporary, but when you furnish an ideal you furnish a permanent possession and a permanent blessing.

Let me apply this principle. Ever since that terrible act which took from us our chief executive there has been much discussion of anarchy, and many remedies have been suggested, but they have all been in the line of suppression. I want to suppress the manifestations of anarchy, but I am not willing to stop with suppression. I do not want us to make the mistake that they have made in the old countries. In those countries in which they have simply employed suppressive measures, they have the most anarchists today. We must go further and remove the spirit of anarchy. There is no place in the United States for the spirit of anarchy. But how is this spirit to be removed? Not by suppression only—for this is but temporary. If we are to have a permanent remedy we must find it in education. We must teach the people that a government is necessary, for it is. We must teach them that our government is the best government on earth, for it is; but that is not enough. It is the duty of everyone to exert himself to the uttermost to make this government so good that every citizen will be willing to die, if need be, to preserve the blessings of this government to his children and to his children's children.

The funeral oration of Pericles is probably with the exception of the oration of Demosthenes on the Crown, the the most famous oration that has come down to us from the Greeks, and the most impressive part of this oration presents as a reason for Greek patriotism the beneficience of the government of that country. After describing the greatness of his country, and the excellence of his government, he said: "It was for such a country then, that these men, resolved not to have it be taken from them, died fighting, and we their survivors may well be willing to suffer in its behalf." The remedy for anarchy is to make the government deserve the love of every citizen. They are doing most to cure the spirit of anarchy who are doing most to make the government perfect in all its parts; they are doing most to cultivate and spread the spirit of anarchy who pervert the aims of the government, rob the many for the benefit of the few and then curse the people who do not like to be robbed. A government can be a great blessing or a great curse. When a government takes from the citizen the power to redress his own wrongs, it assumes the solemn duty of protecting him from every arm uplifted for his injury. If a government first disarms a citizen and then leaves him to be despoiled by those who act under the favoritism of the government, the victim of the wrong, brooding over his injuries, will be likely to listen to the voice of the anarchist.

If any further authority is necessary to support the doctrine which I am trying to present, you will find it in the Bible. The passage reads, "Let your light so

shine before men, that they may see your good works and glorify your Father which is in Heaven." It is the influence of example,—it is the power that goes out from an upright life. There is no influence for good that equals the example of one who shows the world how to live. We have overestimated, I think, the relative importance of the mind, and underestimated the relative importance of the heart in the shaping of human happiness. When I say this do not think that I lack interest in education. I am an enthusiast on the subject of education. I am anxious that every boy and girl in this land shall be educated. Nothing made me more indignant in 1896 than the statement of an eminent divine who declared that the farmers' sons were being educated so much that they were getting dissatified with the position that God intended them to fill. God never made any man wise enough to say in advance what position your boy or my boy was intended to fill. God never made any man wise enough to draw a line and say that the children on one side should be educated and the children on the other side should be neglected. I want my children educated, but I want my neighbor's children educated also, so that if my children lack wisdom they may have the benefit of the wisdom of my neighbor's children. But as enthusiastic as I am on the subject of education, I repeat that I think we have boasted too much of what the mind has done, and not sufficiently considered what the heart can do. We talk of the inventions of genius, and they have indeed been great. We are amazed to think that a man can stand by the side of the telegraph instrument and by

means of the electric current talk with people ten thousand miles away, but if that achievement is wonderful, the achievements of the heart are still more wonderful. The heart that is full of love for its fellows, the heart that yearns to do some great good, the heart that puts into operation some movement for the uplifting of the human race, that heart will speak to hearts that will beat ten thousand years after all our hearts are still. That is more wonderful than talking to people ten thousand miles away.

I go into a cemetery and I find there monuments reared to the dead, and they generally vary in size and beauty according to the amount of the estate left. Sometimes I find a monument reared by grateful hands to one whom the world calls great, but how few of all the countless millions of the human race will ever be remembered a century after their death by any monument that marks their resting place? I am glad that the Creator, as infinite in love as in power, has made it possible for the humblest citizen in all the land, if actuated by a high purpose and inspired by a noble zeal to rear for himself a monument that will endure when all the monuments of granite and of bronze have crumbled to dust.

I fear the plutocracy of wealth and respect the aristocracy of learning, but I thank God for the democracy of the heart that makes it possible for every human being to do something to make life worth living while he lives and the world better for his existence in it. Mathematicians are able to calculate how far it is from the farthest star to the earth, but no

mathematician has yet been able to calculate the influence for good of one kind word, or of one kind act. The life comes into contact with the lives about it, and through this generation it reaches on through the countless generations to come.

This is the measure of individual greatness. No one will dispute that individual greatness is measured by service. If this is the measure of individual greatness, what is the measure of national greatness? Can you have one rule for the individual and an entirely different rule for a nation composed of eighty millions of individuals? What is your idea of a great nation, a great destiny, a great mission? Do you think that this nation can achieve greatness by going out and subjugating half-civilized tribes? Do you think that this nation can achieve greatness by searching the highways and by-ways of the world in the hope of finding inferior people with money enough in their pockets to excite our avarice but without strength to resist our oppression? Is that your idea of a great nation, a great destiny, a great mission? Mine goes beyond it. I want this nation to influence, not the feeble races only but the strong ones as well; I want it to dominate, not merely inferior races, but also superior ones. I want this nation to conquer the world, not with its armies and its navies, but with its ideas. I want this nation to destroy every throne on earth, not by force or violence, but by showing the world something better than a throne—a government resting upon the consent of the governed—strong because it is loved, and loved because it is good. I want this na-

tion to solve the problems of this generation and by doing so not only bless our own people, but give life and hope to those who labor under greater disadvantages than we do.

And how shall we render this service to the world? By a high and noble example. We have an advantage over all the nations of the past in that we have the printing press, the electric current, the steam engine and the steam boat. These bring all the corners of the earth close together, and make it possible for people to know everywhere what is well done anywhere. We have a second advantage in that we have the best form of religion that the world has ever known. I speak not now of the Godward part of our religion. I speak not of those commandments which tell us how we should behave toward our Creator. I speak rather of the manward side of our religion and of those commandments that deal with our conduct toward our fellows, those commandments which were condensed into one great commandment, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." If we can succeed in exemplifying this commandment in individual and national life we shall exert an influence for good upon the human race greater than all the other nations of the earth combined have done before.

We have a third advantage in that we have gathered here the best blood of all the races of the old world. These people who have come to cast in their lot with us are still linked by ties of blood to those across the sea, and any improvement in the science of government or in the art of administration will at once be

communicated to other lands. Our nation is, as it were, a city set on a hill whose light cannot be hid.

Then we have a fourth advantage, in that we have the best government of which the mind of man has conceived. I do not mean to say that our government is perfect in all its details, or that it ever will be perfect, no matter what party is in power, for government, like civilization, is progressive, and while we should strive every day to make our government more and more perfect, the work of improvement will never be fully completed. I repeat that the government is not perfect. I would not jeopardize whatever reputation I may have for truth and veracity by saying that the government is perfect now or will be under any administration. When the democrats are in power I can prove by all the republicans that the government is not perfect, and when the republicans are in power —well, no proof is necessary then—it is then apparent to us, at least, that the government is not perfect. But we have the best government that the world has known because the people can make the government as good as they desire to have. And as the people make progress in virtue and in intelligence, the government reflecting the virtue and intelligence of the people will make progress also. But with this great opportunity comes a great responsibility and as our opportunity is greater than any other nation has ever enjoyed so there presses down upon American citizenship a greater responsibility than the citizens of any other land have ever borne.

If we are to solve the problems that confront us

we must have a rule. Nothing can be done without a rule. Socrates is credited with the saying that you cannot reason with a man until you find some proposition upon which you and he can agree, and that then with this as a foundation you can proceed with an argument. I desire to reason with you, and to do so I must first find some proposition so fundamental that we can all accept it, and so universal that we can apply it in the discussion of all of the problems of government. I find such a fundamental proposition in the declaration of independence, namely, that all men are created equal. This is declared to be a self-evident truth, but by that it is not meant that no one will dispute it. An English historian has said that if there was any money to be made by it, eloquent and learned men would be found to dispute the law of gravitation. No truth that ever fell from lips human or divine is so plain that it will not be disputed by those who find, or think they find, a profit in disputing it. The declaration that all men are created equal is a truth so self-evident that those who desire to dispute it must first attempt to misconstrue it before they dare to deny it. It does not mean that all men are created equal in physical strength; men vary in physical strength, and a man's strength varies from year to year. It does not mean that all men are created equal in mental ability; some inherit more mental ability than others, and some acquire superior mental ability by study and discipline. It does not mean that all men are created equal in moral worth, for moral character is a matter of growth.

Neither does it mean that all men are equal or can be equal in the possession of this world's goods, for if wealth is a reward of merit, it must differ in proportion to merit. Those who believe in the doctrine that all men are created equal are not trying to level society by taking from the industrious to give to the idle, or from the economical to give to the spendthrift. All that they contend for is that the law should be so made and the government so administered that every citizen will secure from society a reward proportionate to his contribution to the wellfare of society. They protest against measuring a civilization by the refinement and happiness of a few and plead for a civilization that will embrace within its benefits every deserving member of society.

The declaration that all men are created equal means that men are created equal in their natural rights. It means that God never gave to one human being a single natural right that he did not give to every other human being, and among these rights the Declaration of Independence enumerates the right to live, the right to liberty and the right to the pursuit of happiness.

Jefferson condensed this fundamental principal of government into a political maxim: "Equal rights to all and especial privileges to none." Upon this maxim can you build a government; upon no other maxim, can you build a government like ours.

It is in the application of this principle that we find differences of opinion and these differences are sometimes due to lack of information, sometimes to prejudice, and sometims to real or supposed difference in interest. Let me apply this principle briefly to a few questions before the country, in order to show how universal is its application. I am not so anxious to have you accept my application of this principle as I am to have you make some application that will satisfy your own judgments and consciences. I am not so anxious to have you think as I think on these subjects as I am to have you think, because those who think will ultimately arrive at a correct conclusion, while those who refuse to think or who fail to think cannot assist in the solution of any great question.

Let me apply this principle, first, to the most familiar of all public questions, the question of taxation. Other questions may come and other questions may go, but the question of taxation, like Tennyson's brook, goes on and on forever. We may dispute about the amount to be collected and we may dispute about the method of collection, but the subject of taxation is with us always. The object to be aimed at is absolute justice in the collection of each citizen's share of the taxes. Unjust taxation is nothing less than larceny under the form of law for it takes from one more than he should pay, while it leaves in the pockets of another money that in equity belongs to the government. An unjust system of taxes, therefore, merely transfers money without right from one man's pocket to the pocket of another, and if the law is made by those who

avoid burdens that they should bear and is made for the purpose of avoiding those burdens it is as indefensible in morals as it is from the standpoint of political economy.

Is there any rule by which we can determine in what proportion people should pay taxes? Adam Smith suggested a rule a century ago but it is so just that it must have been thought of long before he was born. The rule is that citizens should contribute to the support of their government in exact proportion to the benefits received by them from their government. While all will accept this as an abstract proposition, it is surprising how far we deviate from it in actual practice. Take the Internal Revenue Tax as an illustration. It is paid by those who use liquor and tobacco, and it is paid, not in proportion to the wealth of the consumers, not in proportion to their incomes; and not in proportion to the amount of protection they receive from the government, but in proportion to the liquor and tobacco used; and it is needless to say that the poor, as a rule, contribute a larger proportion of their incomes than the rich to support the government in so far as they are taxed through the Internal Revenue Department. The same is true of tariff taxes. Import duties are laid upon what we eat and wear and use, and the duty, if reduced to an ad valorum, is usually heaviest upon articles which the poor use. As people do not eat, wear clothing or use taxable merchandise in proportion to their incomes, it will be seen that the poor contribute a larger proportion of their incomes than the rich to the support of

the government in so far as the revenue is collected through import duties. The income tax has been suggested as a step toward an equalization of the burdens of government. The income tax adjusts itself to the man's income; if he has a small income to pay with, his tax is small, and if the tax is large it is because his income is large. While there is no scientifically exact means of determining the proportion in which people profit by the protection of the government, there is no safer measure than the size of the income, and therefore, no system of taxes more nearly approaches justice than that which makes the contribution to the government proportionate to the income of the contributor. If the income tax were the only system of taxation in use, justice would require that the taxes should be levied upon small incomes as well as large ones, but, when the system is used in connection with an Internal Revenue system, which over-burdens the poor, and in connection with a tariff system, which also over-burdens the poor, justice requires that small incomes be made exempt from the income tax in order that the total taxes may be equitably distributed.

Let us apply this maxim to the trust question. In opposing what are called trusts, the line ought to be drawn at the private monopoly; that is, the government should prohibit the existence of any corporation large enough to exercise a controlling influence upon the production or price of a commodity. Up to this point, combinations of capital may be defended or criticised, for there are arguments on both sides, but

when a combination of capital reaches a point where it is able to control either the product or the price to be demanded, so that the consumer is at the mercy of this one producer, then the corporation, being a monopoly, becomes indefensible and intolerable. It does not require an extended knowledge of history to enable one to condemn a private monopoly, although history furnishes an abundance of incontrovertable proof. All that one needs to know is human nature and the rules which he applies in every-day life. No one would be willing to try a case before a judge who was a party to the suit, neither would any one be willing to try a case before a jury whose members were pecuniarily interested in the result of the suit. In the case of a private monopoly, the consumer is compelled to try his case before a tribunal composed of the men in charge of the trust and they are pecuniarily interested in deciding against him. If we are to destroy the monopoly, it must be by an attack upon the principle and not by an attack upon those monopolies which are most offensive or whose managers show the least conscience. If monopolies are to be destroyed, it must be upon the maxim of "equal rights to all and special privileges to none." This maxim is violated when the country is delivered into the hands of men who have a pecuniary interest in extorting as much as possible regardless of the services rendered by them. When there is competition, the consumer has protection; when there is no competition, the consumer is almost sure to be plundered —he cannot afford to rely upon the mercy of an occasional benevolent trust magnate.

The principle for which we are contending must be applied to the labor question also, and nowhere is this application more necessary at this time. In dealing with the labor question, the recognition of equal rights to all is essential. The right of the laboring man to a trial by jury is as sacred as the right of other members of society to a trial before a jury of peers. This right is denied by government by injunction. The right of laboring men to reasonable hours ought to be observed as sacredly as the right of other members of society to reasonable hours. If we recognize as we do the necessity for hours of recreation for ourselves and families, we ought not to begrudge these hours to those who toil at less pleasant and more fatiguing work. If we desire an income that will relieve our children from the necessity of labor while they are young, we should not forget that the laborer has the same interest in his children and that society, too, has a right to demand that they should be so cared for and so educated that they can, when grown, give to their country the highest and most efficient service. At this time, one of the most important questions in connection with labor is the question of arbitration, and it is becoming more and more apparent that a peaceful adjustment of the differences between corporations and their employes is as necessary to the welfare of society at large as it is to the laboring man. There is no more reason why a laboring man should be compelled to fight out his differences with his employer by strike or boycott than there is for compelling citizens to abandon

courts of justice and settle their differences with each other personally. "Equal rights to all and special privileges to none" must therefore be observed in the settlement of the problems that affect employe and employer.

Even the money question can be settled by this Jeffersonian maxim, and it can be settled in no other way. There is but one kind of dollar that can be defined as an ideal dollar and that is the stable dollar—the dollar that does not change in its average purchasing power. The most fundamental principle in the science of money is that a dollar is good in proportion as its average purchasing power is fixed and unchanging. The second is that the value of a dollar, other things being equal, depends upon the number of dollars—an increase in the volume of money decreasing the purchasing power of the dollar, a decrease in the volume of money increasing the purchase power of the dollar. Sometimes "an honest dollar" has been defined as a dollar which does not suffer loss in melting, but no one who has any knowledge of the science of money would attempt to defend the "melting-pot test" as a test of honest money. Whether a dollar can be melted without loss is entirely due to the law. If the law provides, as it does, that 25 8-10 grains of standard gold can be coined into a dollar without charge then the melting of a dollar does not destroy any of its value, because it can be immediately recoined without loss. If, however, the law fixed a coinage charge, then the dollar would lose value to the extent of that coinage charge because that amount

would have to be added to the melted gold to convert it into a coined dollar. At present, a gold dollar can be melted without loss because it can be recoined without charge; a silver dollar cannot be melted without loss because when melted it cannot be recoined at all. For about twenty-four years after 1873, the crusade against silver resulted in a constant rise in the purchasing power of the dollar and a constant fall in the value of property as measured by money. It was to check this fall and to restore the parity between money and property that bimetallists throughout the world contended for the remonetization of silver. Since 1896, an increase in the production of gold has brought in part what the restoration of bitmetallism would have brought in a greater measure, but conditions have been so unusual since 1896 that it is not yet possible to tell whether the equilibrium between money and property has been restored, neither is it possible to calculate for how long a period the new gold supplies will be sufficient. It is certain that the quantity of money in circulation must constantly increase in order to keep pace with population and business, and, whenever the supply of money fails to keep pace with the demand for it, we shall always have an era of rising dollars and falling prices, and the term "falling-prices" is but another term for business depression and hard times. Only by recognizing the doctrine of equal rights to all and special privileges to none can we hope to reach an adjustment of the money question that will be permanent, for no adjustment can be regarded as permanent that does not do justice as between man and man.

But while I am anxious that we shall apply the doctrine of "equal rights to all and special privileges to none" to all our domestic questions and thus settle them rightly, both for our own good and for the example of others, I am also anxious that we shall apply this doctrine in our dealings with foreign nations; for they will recognize the principle much more clearly when it is applied to international questions than when it is applied to our domestic problems. Just now we are being watched much more closely than usual. We are on the witness-stand, and our testimony will either strengthen the doctrine of self-government everywhere or weaken it throughout the world. There are but two theories of government--in all history, no others have been suggested. These are, first, that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, and, second, that governments rest upon force. If government by what is called divine right seems to be a third, it is not really so. It is only a subdivision of the second form, for no king can assert a divine right to rule, unless he has a force superior to any one who contests his right.

In dealing with Cuba, we recognized the inalienable right of the people of Cuba to liberty and independence. We cannot deny the equally inalienable right of the people of the Philippines to liberty and self government without a departure from our theory of government. And in dealing with the Philippine question, we must determine whether our nation is to be a physical force ruling where it can and defending

its rule by the arguments used in defense of monarchies or whether we shall be a moral force ruling where we do rule by the consent of the governed and influencing others by the force of our example. If the Filipinos desired to become a part of our people we might make them citizens but for the race question which it would raise—and we have enough race trouble now—but to hold them as colonies, to tax them without representation and govern them without the consent of the governed would mean a return to dogmas of arbitrary power which our forefathers successfully resisted.

If we have faith in the truths set forth in the Declaration of Independence and there said to be self-evident; if we have faith in the triumph of these truths; if we have faith in the influence of a high and holy example; if we have faith in the Christian doctrine of the triumph of righteousness, we will not substitute war and conquest for the peaceful progress of the past.

This nation should be a great nation, a conquering nation. It should overcome the world. How? By following the precept given in Holy Writ: "Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good."

The Attractions of Farming

Written for and copyrighted by The Saturday Evening Post, Philadelphia, and reproduced by courtesy of that journal

THE ATTRACTIONS OF FARMING.

Before mentioning the modern improvements which add to the comfort of farm life, the agriculturist's place in the nation's economy and the advantages offered by the farm deserve attention. Of all the toilers the tiller of the ground is in closest touch with Mother Earth. He learns the secrets of Nature, watches the seasons, and is the alchemist at whose touch base soil is transmuted into golden grain, grass into milk and meat, and rainfall into the syrup of the cane. He feeds the world and clothes it as well. If the farmers by concerted action were to take a year's vacation, the trader, the artisan, the teacher and the members of the learned professions would soon be petitioning upon bended knees for their return to work. Those who are content to live without considering the source whence come the necessaries of life scarcely realize how dependent they are upon the farmer's brain and muscle. If the steak is tender it is because the farmer has by a wise selection cultivated good breeds, raised nutritious food, and, despite the heat or cold, brought the food in proper quantity and proportion to the animals whose flesh supplies the table. The flour in the bread is made from wheat that has to be sown and harvested, threshed and delivered at the railway station before it passes between the stones at the mill. The sugar that sweetens the tea and the coffee has its story to tell of the farmer's care and constancy, while

the early vegetables testify to his vigilance and industry. And yet many who "fare sumptuously every day" give little thought to the farmer's labors.

Not only is the farmer the firm foundation upon which all other classes rest, but his vocation gives the broadest training to the threefold man. If civilization can be defined as the harmonious development of the human race, physically, mentally and morally, then agriculture is truly a civilizing agency. The field is better equipped than the gymnasium with the appliances necessary for physical training. All the muscles of the body are brought into play, and the air has a freshness and a wholesomeness that no system of ventilation can provide. The resident of the city finds that his daily exercise not only costs him money but costs him time, and he ofte ntakes it grudgingly and from a sense of duty. The farmer finds his exercise both useful and profitable. In the city there is little that a boy can do; on the farm there is employment for persons of every age—employment that does not overtax their strength and need not trespass upon their school hours.

That the farm gives a good foundation for mental training is evident to any one who has compared the school records of country boys with the school records of the boys in the cities. Habits of application, of industry and of thoroughness in school come naturally enough to one who has been trained to farm work. Not only does the farm furnish mental athletes for the city, but the average farmer possesses more information of general value than the average resident of a city. If he has not always read the latest fiction

or the most sensational criminal news, he has generally read something fully as useful. The long evenings of the winter, the rainy days of the summer, and the Sabbath days throughout the year give him many hours for reading, and while at work he has more time for meditation and for the digestion of what he reads than those employed at other kinds of labor.

He is not afflicted with insomnia nor troubled with nervous prostration. He has the "sound mind in the sound body" which has been sought in every age.

To an even greater extent is the farmer's occupation conducive to moral development. Bondaref, a Russian author much praised by Tolstoy, says: "It is physically impossible that true religious knowledge or pure morality should exist among any classes of a nation who do not work with their hands for their bread." To the farmer the miracle is of daily occurrence. The feeding of a multitude with a few loaves and fishes cannot mystify one who every spring watches the earth's awakening and estimates the millions who are to be supplied by the chemistry of the vegetable. Resurrection and immortality are easily understood by one who sees a harvest spring from buried grain, and the fruits of a new birth are easily comprehended by one who has watched the earth grow verdant beneath the smiles of a summer's sun. The parables of Christ, taken from every-day life, make plain to the farmer the Divine philosophy. He reads of the sower, and his own experience furnishes a parallel. He knows, too, how a tiny seed can grow into a great tree, and he has seen the tares side by side with the wheat. He is often called upon to exercise pa-

tience with the barren tree, and his faith increases as he follows the blade through all the stages of its development until he sees "the full corn in the ear."

The farmer, while gathering the fruits of his labor and enriching himself by adding to the world's wealth, learns the true basis of rewards. He learns to give a dollar's worth of work for a dollar's worth of product, and when he not only produces something, but improves the methods of production, he feels the satisfaction that comes when one makes a genuine contribution to the general welfare. The farmer feels a sense of proprietorship in the product of his labor that is not felt by one who produces as an employee or through an employee. It is this sense of proprietorship and independence that makes one feel, as he grows older, an increasing desire to own his own home, and to have enough land about him to give rest to his body, quiet to his mind and peace to his soul.

The child raised upon the farm has the advantage of occupation, and a great advantage it is—for "Satan finds some mischief still for idle hands to do"—and is shielded from the allurements of the city while good habits are being acquired and character is being formed.

It is not that farm life is without its temptations, but the influence of the father, the mother and the home have a greater field for operation, and parental authority is not here so strained to counteract the force of outside currents.

Did you ever go through a crowded tenement quarter on Sunday afternoon or at twilight in summer? One's heart aches at the sight of the thousands

of little children whose only playground is the sidewalk and whose conceptions of an all-loving and merciful Heavenly Father must be dwarfed and deformed by the squalor and unhappiness about them. They breathe the dust-ladened and soot-poisoned air, and while this enfeebles their bodies, their minds and hearts are exposed to the contagion of the street and the alley.

Even in the cultivation of a taste for the aesthetic the country has its advantages. As some one has expressed it, "God made the country, man made the town." There is a beauty in the handiwork of the Almighty which it is the pride of man to approach but not within his power to reach. A country landscape, with its hues that change with the seasons, cannot be transferred to paper or to canvas. Those who live their lives on narrow streets and have their vision limited by lofty walls miss the glowing tints of the dawn and the rich colorings that streak the west at sunset. They know not the invigorating breezes of the early morning, the music of the birds, or the lowing of the contented kine at nightfall. The cut flowers from the hothouse are not a perfect substitute for the buds that are cultivated by members of the family, and that seem to shed a richer fragrance because they are home grown and represent a care that can be measured.

The most laborious forms of farm labor, considering the quantity of work to be done, are plowing and harvesting grain, hay and corn. The riding plow has robbed one form of its excessive fatigue, the self-binder has supplanted the cradle, and the mower has taken the place of the scythe, while more recently the

corn-cutter has not only lightened the work of gathering corn, but has made it possible to postpone the husking until winter, besides making it easier to save the fodder.

With improved breeds the pleasure of handling stock is largely increased. There is a satisfaction in raising the best kinds of cattle and the best specimens of the various breeds. Take the shorthorn, for instance—one of the best, if not the best, of all-purpose breeds. One takes a pardonable pride in exhibiting such an animal and learns to admire its points of superiority. The shorthorn cow, giving, as she does, a fair quantity of milk of good quality and raising large and easily-fattened calves, is a favorite with the small farmer. If to the herd a few Jerseys can be added the housewife rejoices in still richer milk. The Polled Jersey now has an association of its own and bids fair to rival the Jersey with horns. If one desires to add a dairy to his farm the Holstein is found valuable because of the quantity of milk given, while the Hereford, the Galloway and the Polled Angus are popular with the range.

Hogs, though not noted for that virtue which is said to be next to godliness, are a necessary and profitable adjunct to the farm. They grow into money more rapidly than any other kind of stock, and excite an interest which their greediness cannot entirely destroy. The Poland China has long been a popular breed and still contests for public favor with the Durocas, the Berkshires and the Chester Whites.

Even more fascinating, if possible, is the poultry department of the farm. The numerous breeds give

a wide range for taste, and no one can attend a poultry show without being convinced that the cultivation of barnyard fowls—they are called "birds" if they are of a fine breed—not only furnishes an enjoyable occupation but yields in the aggregate an enormous annual product. The Plymouth Rock is probably the most popular of the dual purpose fowls, although I think the White Wyandottes preferable, possibly for aesthetic rather than economic reasons, the white chickens looking well against a background of green grass, clover or alfalfa.

I have mentioned but two branches of farm work; the raising of stock (cattle and hogs) and the care of poultry. Many farmers make a specialty of horses —driving horses, riding horses, draft horses or race horses. Then the various kinds of crops furnish an opportunity for experiments and investigation, while the garden is the pride of every rural household.

Horticulture is the handmaid of Agriculture and occupies a position of increasing importance. He who plants a tree plans for the future and gives evidence of his interest in posterity. Nor is such labor entirely unselfish, for fruit, grapes and berries, not travel-worn but fresh and wholesome, are a part of the farmer's reward. But enough has been said to indicate the breadth of the field that opens before one who is content to exchange honest labor for the products of the soil.

The agricultural colleges have made wonderful strides during recent years, and, with the experiment stations, are greatly extending the scientific knowledge of the young men who are preparing them-

selves for farm life. As these trained men establish themselves and begin to apply their knowledge we may expect to see the farms and farmhouses better cared for, the fertility of the soil better preserved by a rotation of crops, the stock better selected and better fed, and the yield of the farm increased by wise arrangement of the work. The agricultural experiment stations are becoming an important part of the government's co-operative work. The expense of their experiments is borne by all and the results are free to all. In the case of an invention the patentee is given a monopoly for a term of years as a reward of his contribution to the welfare of society; sometimes the reward is exorbitant, and it often goes to speculators who advance money upon the patent, rather than to the patentee. Where encouragement is given to an industry by a bounty or tariff it is often given through favoritism and can be withdrawn only with great difficulty, but at the experiment stations the work is done by public officials for the benefit of the public.

There is a political reason just now why the work of the agricultural colleges should be heartily encouraged. The interests of the farmer have been neglected by the government. Though the farmer has to pay more than his share of the taxes, measured by his income, the annual appropriations for the army and navy are at present more than thirty times as great as the appropriation for the agricultural department. The members of congress are nearly all residents of the cities, and, without intending it, they naturally give more attention to the needs of the cities than to the needs of the rural districts. Though this is true

to a less extent of State officials and State Legislatures, still, even here the country does not have a representation in proportion to its voting strength. The better education of those who intend to farm will have a tendency to increase the proportion of farmer statesmen and to enlarge the agriculturist's share in the management of the Government. Prince Bismarck was a few years ago quoted as saying that the farmers must stand together and "protect themselves against the drones of society who produce nothing but laws." It is certainly true that the non-producers produce more law than the producers of wealth. The rapidly increasing interest taken in the work of agricultural colleges gives promise of a salutary change in this respect.

These colleges are also destined to perform an important work in teaching the dignity of labor. It has been too much the custom to regard the academy and the college as established for the professional classes only, and farm work has too frequently been left to those with inferior educational advantages. With better instruction and more complete college training the farmers of the next generation will emphasize the fact that an intelligent acquaintance with manual labor qualifies rather than unfits one for understanding the great industrial and social problems that press for solution. Tolstoy attributes most of the estrangement between the classes to lack of sympathy, and believes that sympathy can best be cultivated by a return to bread-labor—the primary struggle with Nature—each one doing enough manual labor to produce his own bread. If Tolstoy is correct, then

the industrial schools in the cities and the agricultural colleges ought to exert a powerful influence in reconciling and harmonizing labor and capital.

A number of influences are at work which tend to add greatly to the attractiveness and enjoyment of country life, without robbing it of its distinctive advantages. The rural delivery, in addition to its great convenience, has already increased the amount of mail sent and received by farmers. The postal check and the extension of the parcel post will still further contribute to his welfare. The telephone lessens by one-half the anxious hours of suspense between sickness or accident and the arrival of relief, besides putting the farmer into immediate communication with the telegraph office and with his neighbors. He can now arrange his shipments with less risk and can effect a considerable saving in time. The electric lines are bringing cheap and rapid transit to an ever-increasing proportion of the population and are destined to increase the value of suburban property at the expense of the tenement-house and the flat. Joint high schools, rural libraries and the delivery of children to and from the schoolhouse are improving the educational facilities in the country. The good roads movement is destined still further to augment the farmer's comfort and well-being by raising the mud embargo and making the carrying of crops possible, and social intercourse easier, during the wet months.

The manufacture of acetylene and other kinds of gas has been so perfected that it is possible for the farmer to equip his home at small expense with

light equal to the gas of the cities, and the experiments now being made with alcohol give promise of a time when the prairie states can convert their corn and potatoes into alcohol and supply themselves with a material suitable for heating and illumination. With alcohol freed from the tax and made unfit for drinking, the Mississippi Valley will be quite independent of the oil trust and the anthracite coal trust.

The greatest convenience in city life is the water supply in the house. No woman who has enjoyed for a time the luxury of running water in the house can quite adjust herself to the old way of bringing water from the well of cistern. It is not surprising therefore, to find a rapidly increasing number of farmers equipping their homes with a water system that furnishes water for the sink, the bathtub and the closet. For some time the tank in the attic was the only means of distributing water through the house, but the compressed air tank is rapidly taking its place. The attic tank, because of the possibility of freezing in the winter and leakage at any time, was always a source of anxiety. The compressed air tank can be placed in the basement, or outside underground, and answers every purpose. (Where the tank is placed under-ground it is best to have a space around it sufficient to permit inspection and repair.) In the prairie states the windmill is now employed to fill the tank, and when geared to work automatically the pressure can be kept at any point desired. Now that to the former advantages of the country home the conveniences of the city are being added, we may expect a reversal of the tendency toward an increase in

the proportion of the urban population. If the tide turns, as it seems likely to, and the congestion of the city is relieved by the settling of adjacent fields and the reclamation of arid lands, it is difficult to estimate fully the effect upon the country. The municipal problems which are absorbing so much attention the problems of sociologoy and the problems of government in general, will be made easier, and the foundation will be laid for a higher and more enduring national life. The bringing of the extremes of society nearer together and the cultivation of a more cordial, fraternal feeling will not be the least of the blessings to be hoped for from the improvements that are making farming more attractive and country life more inviting.

Peace

Address Delivered by Mr. Bryan before the Holland Society, New York City. January, 1904

PEACE

Mr. President, Members of the Holland Society, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I esteem it a great privilege to be here. I received this invitation while I was in Europe, and your President sent me a book telling what has been done by the society and reproducing some of the speeches that had been made. He also gave me the names of some of the distinguished men who, in times past, have appeared before this society. It is a great array of distinguished names, and as I looked over them and saw how they represented different elements of our national life and recalled different characteristics of the early settlers, I wondered if in the selection you had not tried to find men living today who in some way would remind you of the great men among the Dutch. For instance, I see that Senator Depew of New York has spoken here, and I feel sure that he was invited because he can make as good a bargain as Peter Minuit who bought the island from the Indians. And then I see that the President has been here. It has been suggested that he was selected because he recalled the strenuousnss of Peter Stuyvesant. I do not know why I was invited, unless my reticence might have suggested William the Silent.

I accepted your invitation gladly, because I know by observation that one can learn much more by see-

ing things than by reading about them. I had read of the way the early Dutch lived here, and I wanted to come in order that I might have an object-lesson, for, of course, your banquet here is made as much as possible like the dinners that they had upon Manhattan in the early days. I can almost see those Dutch now, and I can hear them, or I thought I heard them when I heard the rattle of your wooden shoes upon the floor. But, do you know, I have been wondering since I came if a part of the history of these early settlers had not been left untold. We all know that the English came one time and took possession. Now, I have been among the English lately, and I cannot believe that they would do anything so impolite, at least those whom I met were not, I am sure, responsible or anything very bad. And this is the way I explain it: The Dutch were eating then, as you are eating now; they had a sumptuous repast, and the English, learning of it, were simply unable to withstand the temptation to take possession of the tables. And if the Dutch who were at the tables. felt as little like fighting as I do now, they did not make a very vigorous resistance. But as soon as they had time to digest their food and rest a little, they went and took back the tables from the English. I am saisfied that that accounts for the temporary cession of Manhattan Island. I am glad to be here, glad to see you, and glad to learn just how they did in those days, for I think I understand the Dutch better now than I did when I simply read about them.

I have enjoyed the speeches made, only I am a little embarrassed by the compliments paid by my good friend, (Mr. Beck,) and I think I understand now why he apologized for what he was going to say. He knew he was going to speak so well that he would have to apologize for it, or it would seem unfair to me. As I listened to him, I could not help thinking of the excuse a Chinese editor once gave for rejecting a manuscript that some one sent in—it was probably from "Pro Bono Publico," "Constant Reader," or "Veritas." The editor sent it back, saying that he was unwilling to publish it because it was of so high an order of merit that it would set a standard of excellence that no one else could approach and that it would, therefore, cause a good deal of dissatisfaction in the country. I am afraid that Mr. Beck has set such a high standard of oratory here that it will be very difficult for myself and for the speakers at future Holland Society dinners to rise to his standard. Another thing, I am embarrassed by the fact that both he and my friend Dr. Lorimer over here touched on politics. I do not like to have anybody touch on politics when I come last. I do not know how I am going to withstand the temptation to talk politics unless I retaliate on Brother Lorimer; as he, a preacher, made a political speech, I, somewhat in politics, may preach a sermon.

My subject is Peace, and I have been thinking about it, especially since the trip that I made to the Netherlands. I am not going to speak here of the wonderful bravery of those people, a bravery exemplified all through their history, a bravery of which

we had a recent illustration, when a handful of them down in South Africa made such a heroic fight for their political existence. While they failed there, they brought blessings to liberty-loving people everywhere, for they made a war of conquest so expensive that no nation in the near future will attempt to take independence from a republic, however small.

I have been thinking of the progress made by the inhabitants of the Netherlands, how they have rescued their lands from the seas and won their victory over Neptune. I was interested in the quaint cities there, in their hundreds of canals and their leaning buildings. I was interested in all that I saw, but I was impressed most by the fact that the Netherlands is to furnish the site for the Temple of Peace soon to be erected; that on that soil, reddened by the blood of an Eighty Years' War, will rise the permanent home of the Arbitration Court. At The Hague I recalled the long struggle for freedom of conscience, for freedom of speech, and for constitutional government, and rejoiced that at last the fragrant flower of peace had appeared upon the thorny stalk of war. I am glad that an American citizen has contributed the money that makes it possible for this building to be erected in a place so well fitted for it. And as I thought of little Holland—little among the nations and yet great in contests where mind and heart control—I recalled the words of the Prophet of old, who foretold an era of peace so universal and so profound that to emphasize it he pictured it as extending even to the animals, and said that the wolf would dwell with the lamb, that the leopard would lie down

with the kid, that the calf, the lion, and the fatling would keep company together, and that a little child should lead them. Are our eyes to witness the fulfilment of this prohpecy?

In a forum where right prevails and where disputes are settled, not by armed force but by reason, a little nation like the Netherlands can enter into an honorable rivalry with her more populous neighbors. But this has not come all at once. It has been of gradual growth, as all things are of gradual growth that are strong and lasting. The trees that are able to withstand the storms mature slowly, and so do great movements.

> "Heaven is not gained by a single bound;
> We build the ladder by which we rise
> From the lowly earth to the vaulted skies,
> And mount its sumit round by round."

So with reforms; it takes time to work them out. We need not expect that the nations will disband their armies at once; we need not expect that all difficulties will be taken before the Court of Arbitration; but we have reason to believe that the light of a better day is dawning, and that we are about to enter upon an era in which conscience will assert its supremacy over brute force, and the crown of victory be awarded, not to the nation that has the largest army or the strongest navy, but to the nation that sets the best example and contributes most to the welfare of the world.

Sometimes when we see the war spirit rampant, we are tempted to say with the poet,

"Right forever on the scaffold,
Wrong forever on the throne."

but in such hours we can draw inspiration and encouragement from Holy Writ. When Elijah was fleeing from the wrath of wicked Jezebel and believed all the prophets to have been slain, the Lord commanded him to stand upon the mountain, and as he stood there, a mighty wind swept by him and rent the rocks asunder, but God was not in the wind; and after the wind came an earthquake, but God was not in the earthquake; and after the earthquake, a fire, but God was not in the fire; and after the fire, a still, small voice, and it was the voice of God. And so, to-day, throughout the world an increasing number, standing upon the heights, are coming to believe that God is not in the ironclads that sweep the ocean with their guns, that God is not in the armies that shake the earth with their tread, or in the fire of musketry, but in the still, small voice of justice that issues from tribunals like that instituted at The Hague. There have been times when bravery upon the battlefield was considered the highest form of virtue. There have been times when intellectual supremacy and intellectual independence were considered all-sufficient, but the time is coming when heart characteristics will receive the attention that they deserve; time is coming when we shall not define civilization as Buckle defined it, "as measured by the mastery of the human mind over the forces of nature," but shall define it as the harmonious development of the human race, physically, mentally and morally. The time is coming when physical perfection alone will not sat-

isfy, when intellectual training alone will not be sufficient, but when the spiritual man will be considered and his welfare guarded. I believe that we are to build this permanent peace, this permanent arbitration, not upon a plutocracy of wealth or upon an aristocracy of learning, but upon the democracy of the heart. We shall then arraign every evil at the bar of the public conscience, for the most potent force of which man has personal knowledge is the conscience. That conscience can be awakened, and when awakened, its gentle promptings are more imperative than statute laws, and the invisible barriers which it builds around us are stronger than prison walls.

It is to this conscience that nations today appeal when they appear before The Hague tribunal. One of the members of that tribunal told me that he was interested to note that the great nations represented there by counsel spend their time, not in discussing their pecuniary loss or gain, but in defending their honor.

It is impossible to overestimate the influence of this appeal to conscience. As has been well said tonight by China's distinguished Ambassador, the suggestion of this Peace Conference presented by the Emperor of Russia was not a new discovery; it simply gave expression to a sentiment that had been growing in the hearts of people all over the world. And this appeal to conscience must be made in this country as well as in our international relations. We complain not at the great development of the last century; we complain rather that the moral sense has not kept pace with industrial expansion. We are, as it were,

trying to guide a great ship with the apparatus that was scarcely sufficient for a smaller one. It is like equipping the Celtic with the rudder made for the Half-Moon. It is necessary that the moral sense shall be addressed; and when my friend here (Mr. Beck) mentioned the Labor Organization as a menace, I feel like suggesting another danger, more menacing, I think, than any organization of men who are earning their bread in the sweat of the brow.

I refer to the conscienceless organizations of capital that plunder stockholders and patrons, and defy the law. More dangerous, too, than any labor organization is the use of money in elections, money that has debauched our politics and made the purchase of votes common upon the street. Men sell franchises and legislate for the great corporation. The use of money in elections is, to my mind, a far greater menace to this country than anything that comes from the organization of laboring men. And what is the remedy for labor troubles? The same remedy that we are to employ in international politics. It is not to fight among ourselves; it is not to abuse each other; it is to appeal to the conscience of the people—the most potent force, I repeat, of which we have knowledge.

I saw at Rome the great Colosseum, and I recalled the time when the Christian martyrs were dragged into the arena and devoured by the wild beasts. We are told that, when they entered the arena, they assembled in the centre, raised their hands to heaven, and prayed and sang until life was extinct. How helpless they seemed to be! How irresistible

seemed the forces arrayed against them! And yet those people, upon their bended knees, invoked a power stronger than the legions of Rome, and it was only a few decades before their prayers were answered—before their doctrine of love overwhelmed the doctrine of force that had consigned them to their death.

I found in Russia a peasant philosopher preaching the gospel of love. He lives in a land where they have almost a million soldiers. They do not allow some of his articles to be published; they will banish people for circulating them; they stop at the border those who attempt to carry them printed into the country; and yet the doctrine of that apostle of love has so touched the hearts of the people of the world that, while they may punish the people who circulate what he says, they do not lay their hands upon the man himself. What does it mean? It means just what has been said by Carlyle, that thought is stronger than artillery parks, and that back of every great thought is love. I believe that this movement to substitute reason for force in the settlement of differences between nations rests upon love, upon an all-pervading love, upon a love that must in the end triumph. If we build in this country, we must build upon that foundation. If you ask me if there is any doctrine that will bring peace in this country, I reply that it is the doctrine, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," and that that is the only peace-insuring doctrine. Can you bring peace by attacking laborers' organizations? See what they have done; give credit for what they have accomplished. Do not simply blame

them for their errors; give them credit for their achievements. They have given us the Australian ballot, which allows an American citizen to vote according to the dictates of his own conscience and relieves him from the fear of being driven to the polls by his employer. Give them credit for thus maintaining the dignity of American citizenship. Give them credit for having decreased the hours of labor. Do you think it is unjust that the hours of labor should be decreased? We try to take care of our own children—try to take care of them well. When we look after ourselves we try to do it well. If we drive the laboring man from his bed to his work, and then drive him back from his work to his bed, what time is he going to have for the cultivation of his mind and the development of his heart? These men are American citizens. In time of war we need them, and a man who is fit to die for his country, ought to be permitted to live for it and enjoy life in it. These are the people who produce the wealth of this nation. These are the people upon whom our nation rests both in peace and in war. Why not give them justice? Why not deal with them as you would deal with brothers? The labor organizations are trying to prohibit child labor in factories. Go into the factories and see the children at work, bent beneath their cares, and when you remember that you permit this dwarfing of their minds and dwarfing of their bodies, this destroying of their chances for life, ask yourself if you would permit it in the case of your own children; and if not, remember that these children are made in the image of God as your children are, and

that you must love them as you love your own children.

I came here to speak of peace, international peace, a peace that will bring together the nations of the earth, a peace that will give us the substitution of reason and right for force and might. But I am willing to apply that doctrine to my own country, and I am willing to apply it to every question. You, who boast of our descent from the brave Dutch; you, who boast that in your veins is the blood of a noble ancestry; I appeal to you to meet these questions with the heroism that your ancestors displayed. If they were willing to die for their rights, are you not willing to respect the rights of others as well as to defend your own? There is something that is greater than dying for one's own rights. That is great, but I am looking for the time when there will be something greater yet, a civilization beyond any that we have yet seen, a civilization in which the greatest citizen will be, not the man who will die in defense of his own rights, but the man who will die rather than trespass upon the rights of another.

Upon this foundation only can we build peace, peace among citizens and peace among nations. Peace must rest on love, and every question that affects us must be decided not by the way it affects the pocketbook, but as it is determined by the conscience —that prompter which we all have with us if we will but listen to it.

I am very grateful, my friends, for this opportunity to speak to you.

I did not have much chance to speak to some of you during the campaign. You thought that those who talked as I talked, were enemies of yours; we were not. You thought we wanted to injure you; we did not. You thought that we were radical; we were not; we were conservative; we were not advocating retaliation; we were simply asking that our institutions be built on justice. Beware of those who come afterward—of the radicals who will not be content to stop a wrong, but will want to go back and get revenge for what has been done. I appeal to you to meet these questions, and if you love peace, do not love it in Holland only; love it in America. If you love peace, seek the foundation upon which it rests. You will find that when the Nazarene's coming was announced to the Shepherds who kept their flocks by night, it was "Peace on earth, good will towards men." How can you have peace without good will toward men? I appeal to you to consider the true foundation of peace, here and everywhere, and you will find in the recognition of the rights of your fellows a higher happiness and a greater satisfaction than can be found in a shortsighted selfishness that trespasses upon the rights of another, whether that other person be a merchant or a laboring man.

Imperialism

Speech Delivered by Mr. Bryan in response to the Committee appointed to notify him of his nomination to the presidency, at Indianapolis, August 8, 1900.

IMPERIALISM.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Notification Committee: I shall, at an early day, and in a more formal manner accept the nomination which you tender, and I shall at that time discuss the various questions covered by the Democratic platform. It may not be out of place, however, to submit a few observations at this time upon the general character of the contest before us and upon the question which is declared to be of paramount importance in this campaign.

When I say that the contest of 1900 is a contest between Democracy on the one hand and plutocracy on the other I do not mean to say that all our opponents have deliberately chosen to give to organized wealth a predominating influence in the affairs of the Government, but I do assert that on the important issues of the day the Republican party is dominated by those influences which constantly tend to substitute the worship of mammon for the protection of the rights of man.

In 1859 Lincoln said that the Republican party believed in the man and the dollar, but that in case of conflict it believed in the man before the dollar. This is the proper relation which should exist between the two. Man, the handiwork of God, comes first; money, the handiwork of man, is of inferior impor-

tance. Man is the master, money the servant, but upon all important questions today Republican legislation tends to make money the master and man the servant.

The maxim of Jefferson, "equal rights to all and special privileges to none," and the doctrine of Lincoln that this should be a government "of the people, by the people and for the people," are being disregarded and the instrumentalities of government are being used to advance the interests of those who are in a position to secure favors from the Government.

The Democratic party is not making war upon the honest acquisition of wealth; it has no desire to discourage industry, economy and thrift. On the contrary, it gives to every citizen the greatest possible stimulus to honest toil when it promises him protection in the enjoyment of the proceeds of his labor. Property rights are most secure when human rights are most respected. Democracy strives for civilization in which every member of society will share according to his merits.

No one has a right to expect from a society more than a fair compensation for the services which he renders to society. If he secures more it is at the expense of some one else. It is no injustice to him to prevent his doing injustice to another. To him who would, either through class legislation or in the absence of necessary legislation, trespass upon the rights of another the Democratic party says, "Thou shalt not."

Against us are arayed a comparatively small but politically and financially powerful number who really profit by Republican policies; but with them are associated a large number who, because of their attachment to their party name, are giving their support to doctrines antagonistic to the former teachings of their own party.

Republicans who used to advocate bimetallism now try to convince themselves that the gold standard is good; Republicans who were formerly attached to the greenback are now seeking an excuse for giving national banks control of the nation's paper money; Republicans who used to boast that the Republican party was paying off the national debt are now looking for reasons to support a perpetual and increasing debt; Republicans who formerly abhorred a trust now beguile themselves with the delusion that there are good trusts, and bad trusts, while in their minds, the line between the two is becoming more and more obscure; Republicans who, in times past, congratulated the country upon the small expense of our standing army, are now making light of the objections which are urged against a large increase in the permanent military establishment; Republicans who gloried in our independence when the nation was less powerful now look with favor upon a foreign alliance; Republicans who three years ago condemned "forcible annexation" as immoral and even criminal are now sure that it is both immoral and criminal to oppose forcible annexation. That partisanship has already blinded many to present dangers is certain; how large a portion of the Re-

publican party can be drawn over to the new policies remains to be seen.

For a time Republican leaders were inclined to deny to opponents the right to criticise the Philippine policy of the administration, but upon investigation they found that both Lincoln and Clay asserted and exercised the right to criticise a President during the progress of the Mexican war.

Instead of meeting the issue boldly and submitting a clear and positive plan for dealing with the Philippine question, the Republican convention adopted a platform the larger part of which was devoted to boasting and self-congratulation.

In attempting to press economic questions upon the country to the exclusion of those which involve the very structure of our government, the Republican leaders give new evidence of their abandonment of the earlier ideals of their party and of their complete subserviency to pecuniary considerations.

But they shall not be permitted to evade the stupendous and far-reaching issue which they have deliberately brought into the arena of politics. When the president, supported by a practically unanimous vote of the House and Senate, entered upon a war with Spain for the purpose of aiding the struggling patriots of Cuba, the country, without regard to party, applauded.

Although the Democrats realized that the administration would necessarily gain a political advantage from the conduct of a war which in the very nature of the case must soon end in a complete victory, they vied with the Republicans in the support which they

gave to the president. When the war was over and the Republican leaders began to suggest the propriety of a colonial policy opposition at once manifested itself.

When the President finally laid before the Senate a treaty which recognized the independence of Cuba, but provided for the cession of the Philippine Islands to the United States, the menace of imperialism became so apparent that many preferred to reject the treaty and risk the ills that might follow rather than take the chance of correcting the errors of the treaty by the independent action of this country.

I was among the number of those who believed it better to ratify the treaty and end the war, release the volunteers, remove the excuse for war expenditures and then give the Filipinos the independence which might be forced from Spain by a new treaty.

In view of the criticism which my action aroused in some quarters, I take this occasion to restate the reasons given at that time. I thought it safer to trust the American people to give independence to the Filipinos than to trust the accomplishment of that purpose to diplomacy with an unfriendly nation.

Lincoln embodied an argument in the question when he asked, "Can aliens make treaties easier than friends can make laws?" I believe that we are now in a better position to wage a successful contest against imperialism than we would have been had the treaty been rejected. With the treaty ratified a clean-cut issue is presented between a governmnet by consent and a government by force, and imperialists must bear the

responsibility for all that happens until the question is settled.

If the treaty had been rejected the opponents of imperialism would have been held repsonsible for any international complications which might have arisen before the ratification of another treaty. But whatever difference of opinion may have existed as to the best method of opposing a colonial policy, there never was any difference as to the great importance of the question and there is no difference now as to the course to be pursued.

The title of Spain being extinguished we were at liberty to deal with the Filipinos according to American principles. The Bacon resolution, introduced a month before hostilities broke out at Manila, promised independence to the Filipinos on the same terms that it was promised to the Cubans. I supported this resolution and believe that its adoption prior to the breaking out of hostilities would have prevented bloodshed, and that its adoption at any subsequent time would have ended hostilities.

If the treaty had been rejected considerable time would have necessarily elapsed before a new treaty could have been agreed upon and ratified and during that time the question would have been agitating the public mind. If the Bacon resolution had been adopted by the senate and carried out by the president, either at the time of the ratification of the treaty or at any time afterwards, it would have taken the question of imperialism out of politics and left the American people free to deal with their domestic problems. But the

resolution was defeated by the vote of the republican vice-president, and from that time to this a repubican congress has refused to take any action whatever in the matter.

When hostilities broke out at Manila republican speakers and republican editors at once sought to lay the blame upon those who had delayed the ratification of the treaty, and, during the progress of the war, the same republicans have accused the opponents of imperialism of giving encouragement to the Filipinos. This is a cowardly evasion of responsibility.

If it is right for the United States to hold the Philippine Islands permanently and imitate European empires in the government of colonies, the republican party ought to state its position and defend it, but it must expect the subject races to protest against such a policy and to resist to the extent of their abiity.

The Filipinos do not need any encouragement from Americans now living. Our whole history has been an encouragement not only to the Filipinos, but to all who are denied a voice in their own government. If the republicans are prepared to censure all who have used language calculated to make the Filipinos hate foreign domination, let them condemn the speech of Patrick Penry. When he utttered that passionate appeal, "Give me liberty or give me death," he expressed a sentiment which still echoes in the hearts of men.

Let them censure Jefferson; of all the statesmen of history none have used words so offensive to those who would hold their fellows in political bondage. Let

them censure Washington, who declared that the colonists must choose between liberty and slavery. Or, if the statute of limitations has run again the sins of Henry and Jefferson and Washington, let them censure Lincoln, whose Gettysburg speech will be quoted in defense of popular government when the present advocates of force and conquest are forgotten.

Some one has said that a truth once spoken, can never be recalled. It goes on and on, and no one can set a limit to its ever-widening influence. But if it were possible to obliterate every word written or spoken in defense of the principles set forth in the Declaration of Independence, a war of conquest would still leave its legacy of perpetual hatred, for it was God himself who placed in every human heart the love of liberty. He never made a race of people so low in the scale of civilization or intelligence that it would welcome a foreign master.

Those who would have this nation enter upon a career of empire must consider not only the effect of imperialism on the Filipinos, but they must also calculate its effects upon our own nation. We cannot repudiate the principle of self-government in the Philippines without weakening that principle here.

Lincoln said that the safety of this nation was not in its fleets, its armies, or its forts, but in the spirit which prizes liberty as the heritage of all men, in all lands, everywhere, and he warned his countrymen that they could not destroy this spirit without planting the seeds of despotism at their own doors.

Even now we are beginning to see the paralyzing influence of imperialism. Heretofore this nation has

been prompt to express its sympathy with those who were fighting for civil liberty. While our sphere of activity has been limited to the western hemisphere, our sympathies have not been bounded by the seas. We have felt it due to ourselves and to the world, as well as to those who were struggling for the right to govern themselves, to proclaim the interest which our people have, from the date of their own independence, felt in every contest between human rights and arbitrary power.

Three-quarters of a century ago, when our nation was small, the struggles of Greece aroused our people, and Webster and Clay gave eloquent expression to the universal desire for Grecian independence. In 1896 all parties manifested a lively interest in the success of the Cubans, but now when a war is in progress in South Africa, which must result in the extension of the monarchical idea, or in the triumph of a republic, the advocates of imperialism in this country dare not say a word in behalf of the Boers.

Sympathy for the Boers does not arise from any unfriendliness towards England; the American people are not unfriendly toward the people of any nation. This sympathy is due to the fact that, as stated in our platform, we believe in the principles of self-government and reject, as did our forefathers, the claims of monarchy. If this nation surrenders its belief in the universal application of the principles set forth in the Declaration of Independence, it will lose the prestige and influence which it has enjoyed among the nations as an exponent of popular government.

Our opponents, conscious of the weakness of their cause, seek to confuse imperialism with expansion, and have even dared to claim Jefferson as a supporter of their policy. Jefferson spoke so freely and used language with such precision that no one can be ignorant of his views. On one ocasion he declared: "If there be one principle more deeply rooted than any other in the mind of every American, it is that we should have nothing to do with conquest." And again he said: "Conquest is not in our principles; it is inconsistent with our government."

The forcible annexation of territory to be governed by arbitrary power differs as much from the acquisition of territory to be built up into states as a monarchy differs from a democracy. The democratic party does not oppose expansion when expansion enlarges the area of the republic and incorporates land which can be settled by American citizens, or adds to our population people who are willing to become citizens and are capable of discharging their duties as such.

The acquisition of the Louisiana territory, Florida, Texas and other tracts which have been secured from time to time enlarged the republic and the constitution followed the flag into the new territory. It is now proposed to seize upon distant territory already more densely populated than our own country and to force upon the people a government for which there is no warrant in our constitution or our laws.

Even the argument that this earth belongs to those who desire to cultivate it and who have the physical

power to acquire it cannot be invoked to justify the appropriation of the Philippine islands by the United States. If the islands were uninhabited American citizens would not be willing to go there and till the soil. The white race will not live so near the equator. Other nations have tried to colonize in the same latitude. The Netherlands have controlled Java for three hundred years and yet today there are less than sixty thousand people of European birth scattered among the twenty-five million natives.

After a century and a half of English domination in India, less than one-twentieth of one per cent of the people of India are of English birth, and it requires an army of seventy thousand British sodiers to take care of the tax collectors. Spain had asserted title to the Philippine islands for three centuries and yet when our fleet entered Manila bay there were less than ten thousand Spaniards residing in the Philippines.

A colonial policy means that we shall send to the Philippine islands a few traders, a few taskmasters and a few officeholders and an army large enough to support the authority of a small fraction of the people while they rule the natives.

If we have an imperial policy we must have a great standing army as its natural and necessary complement. The spirit which will justify the forcible annexation of the Philippine islands will justify the seizure of other islands and the domination of other people, and with wars of conquest we can expect a certain if not rapid, growth of our military establishment.

That a large permanent increase in our regular army is intended by republican leaders is not a matter

of conjecture, but a matter of fact. In his message of December 5, 1898, the president asked for authority to increase the standing army to 100,000. In 1896 the army contained about 25,000. Within two years the president asked for four times that many, and a republican house of representatives complied with the request after the Spanish treaty had been signed, and when no country was at war with the United States.

If such an army is demanded when an imperial policy is contemplated, but not openly avowed, what may be expected if the people encourage the republican party by indorsing its policy at the polls?

A large standing army is not only a pecuniary burden to the people and, if accompanied by compulsory service, a constant source of irritation, but it is ever a menace to a republican form of government.

The army is the personification of force, and militarism will inevitably change the ideals of the people and turn the thoughts of our young men from the arts of peace to the science of war. The government which relies for its defense upon its citizens is more likely to be just than one which has at call a large body of professional soldiers.

A small standing army and a well-equipped and well-disciplined state militia are sufficient at ordinary times, and in an emergency the nation should in the future as in the past place its dependence upon the volunteers who come from all occupations at their country's call and return to productive labor when their services are no longer required—men who fight when the country needs fighters and work when the country needs workers.

The republican platform assumes that the Philippine islands will be retained under American sovereignty, and we have a right to demand of the republican leaders a discussion of the future status of the Filipino. Is he to be a citizen or a subject? Are we to bring into the body politic eight or ten million Asiatics, so different from us in race and history that amalgamation is impossible? Are they to share with us in making the laws and shaping the destiny of this nation? No republican of prominence has been bold enough to advocate such a proposition.

The McEnery resolution, adopted by the senate immediately after the ratification of the treaty, expressly negatives this idea. The democratic platform describes the situation when it says that the Filipinos cannot be citizens without endangering our civilization. Who will dispute it? And what is the alternative? If the Filipino is not to be a citizen, shall we make him a subject? On that question the democratic patform speaks with equal emphasis. It declares that the Filipino cannot be a subject without endangering our form of government. A republic can have no subjects. A subject is possible only in a government resting upon force; he is unknown in a government deriv- without consent and taxation without representation.

The republican platform says that "the largest measure of self-government consistent with their welfare and our duties shall be secured to them (the Filipinos) by law." This is a strange doctrine for a government which owes its very existence to the men who offered their lives as a protest against government

witohut consent and taxation without representation.

In what respect does the position of the republican party differ from the position taken by the English government in 1776? Did not the English government promise a good government to the colonists? What king ever promised a bad government to his people? Did not the English government promise that the colonists should have the largest measure of self-government consistent with their welfare and English duties? Did not the Spanish government promise to give to the Cubans the largest measure of self-government consistent with their welfare and Spanish duties? The whole difference between a monarchy and a republic may be summed up in one sentence. In a monarchy the king gives to the people what he believes to be a good government; in a republic the people secure for themseves what they believe to be a good government.

The republican party has accepted the European idea and planted itself upon the ground taken by George III., and by every ruler who distrusts the capacity of the people for self-government or denies them a voice in their own affairs.

The republican platform promises that some measure of self-government is to be given the Filipinos by law; but even this pledge is not fulfilled. Nearly sixteen months elapsed after the ratification of the treaty before the adjournment of congress last June and yet no law was passed dealing with the Philippine situation. The will of the president has been the only law in the Philippine islands wherever the American authority extends.

Why does the republican party hesitate to legislate upon the Philippine question? Because a law would disclose the radical departure from history and precedent contemplated by those who control the republican party. The storm of protest which greeted the Porto Rican bill was an indication of what may be expected when the American people are brought face to face with legislation upon this subject.

If the Porto Ricans, who welcomed annexation, are to be denied the guarantees of our constitution, what is to be the lot of the Filipinos, who resisted our authority? If secret influences could compel a disregard of our plain duty toward friendly people, living near our shores, what treatment will those same influences provide for unfriendly people 7,000 miles away? If, in this country where the people have a right to vote, republican leaders dare not take the side of the people against the great monopolies which have grown up within the last few years, how can they be trusted to protect the Filipinos from the corporations which are waiting to exploit the islands?

Is the sunlight of full citizenship to be enjoyed by the people of the United States, and the twilight of semi-citizenship endured by the people of Porto Rico, while the thick darkness of perpetual vassalage covers the Philippines? The Porto Rico tariff law asserts the doctrine that the operation of the constitution is confined to the forty-five states.

The democratic party disputes this doctrine and denounces it as repugnant to both the letter and spirit of our organic law. There is no place in our system

of government for the deposit of arbitrary and irresponsible power. That the leaders of a great party should claim for any president or congress the right to treat millions of people as mere "possessions" and deal with them unrestrained by the constitution or the bill of rights shows how far we have already departed from the ancient landmarks and indicates what may be expected if this nation deliberately enters upon a career of empire.

The territorial form of government is temporary and preparatory, and the chief security a citizen of a territory has is found in the fact that he enjoys the same constitutional guarantees and is subject to the same general laws as the citizen of a state. Take away this security and his rights will be violated and his interests sacrificed at the demand of those who have political influence. This is the evil of the colonial system, no matter by what nation it is applied.

What is our title to the Philippine islands? Do we hold them by treaty or by conquest? Did we buy them or did we take them? Did we purchase the people? If not, how did we secure title to them? Were they thrown in with the land? Will the republicans say that inanimate earth has value but that when that earth is molded by the divine hand and stamped with the likeness of the Creator it becomes a fixture and passes with the soil? If governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, it is impossible to secure title to people, either by force or by purchase.

We could extinguish Spain's title by treaty, but if we hold title we must hold it by some method consistent with our ideas of government. When we made allies of the Filipinos and armed them to fight against Spain, we disputed Spain's title. If we buy Spain's title we are not innocent purchasers.

There can be no doubt that we accepted and utilized the services of the Filipinos, and that when we did so we had full knowledge that they were fighting for their own independence, and I submit that history furnishes no example of turpitude baser than ours if we now substitute our yoke for the Spanish yoke.

Let us consider briefly the reasons which have been given in support of an imperialistic policy. Some say that it is our duty to hold the Philippine islands. But duty is not an argument; it is a conclusion. To ascertain what our duty is, in any emergency, we must apply well settled and generally accepted principles. It is our duty to avoid stealing, no matter whether the thing to be stolen is of great or little value. It is our duty to avoid killing a human being, no matter where the human being lives or to what race or class he belongs.

Every one recognizes the obligation imposed upon indivduals to observe both the human and the moral law, but as some deny the application of those laws to nations, it may not be out of place to quote the opinions of others. Jefferson, than whom there is no higher political authority, said:

"I know of but one code of morality for men, whether acting singly or collectively."

Franklin, whose learning, wisdom and virtue are a part of the priceless legacy bequeathed to use from the revolutionary days, expressed the same idea in even stronger language when he said:

"Justice is strictly due between neighbor nations as between neighbor citizens. A highwayman is as much a robber when he plunders in a gang as when single; and the nation that makes an unjust war is only a great gang."

Many may dare to do in crowds what they would not dare to do as individuals, but the moral character of an act is not determined by the number of those who join it. Force can defend a right, but force has never yet created a right. If it was true, as declared in the resolutions of intervention, that the Cubans "are and of right ought to be free and independent" (language taken from the Declaration of Independence), it is equally true that the Filipinos "are and of right ought to be free and independent."

The right of the Cubans to freedom was not based upon their proximity to the United States, nor upon the language which they spoke, nor yet upon the race or races to which they belonged. Congress by a practically unanimous vote declared that the principles enunciated at Philadelphia in 1776 were still alive and applicable to the Cubans. Who will draw a line between the natural rights of the Cubans and the Filipinos? Who will say that the former has a right to liberty and that the latter has no rights which we are bound to respect? And, if the Filipinos "are and of right ought to be free and independent," what right

have we to force our government upon them without their consent? Before our duty can be ascertained their rights must be determined, and when their rights are once determined it is as much our duty to respect those rights as it was the duty of Spain to respect the rights of the people of Cuba or the duty of England to respect the rights of the American colonists. Rights never conflict; duties never clash. Can it be our duty to usurp political rights which belong to others? Can it be our duty to kill those who, following the example of our forefathers, love liberty well enough to fight for it?

A poet has described the terror which overcame a soldier who in the midst of the battle discovered that he had slain his brother. It is written "All ye are brethren." Let us hope for the coming day when human life—which when once destroyed cannot be restored—will be so sacred that it will never be taken except when necessary to punish a crime already com mitted, or to prevent a crime about to be commtited!

It is said that we have assumed before the world obligations which make it necessary for us to permanently maintain a government in the Philippine islands. I reply first, that the highest obligation of this nation is to be true to itself. No obligation to any particular nations, or to all the nations combined, can require the abandonment of our theory of government, and the substitution of doctrines against which our whole national life has been a protest. And, second, that our obligation to the Filipinos, who inhabit the islands, is greater than any obligation which we can owe to for-

eigners who have a temporary residence in the Philippines or desire to trade there.

It is argued by some that the Filipinos are incapable of self-government and that therefore, we owe it to the world to take control of them. Admiral Dewey, in an official report to the navy department, declared the Filipinos more capable of self-government than the Cubans and said that he based his opinion upon a knowledge of both races. But I will not rest the case upon the relative advancement of the Filipinos. Henry Clay, in defending the right of the people of South America to self-government, said:

"It is the doctrine of thrones that man is too ignorant to govern himself. Their partisans assert his incapacity in reference to all nations; if they cannot command universal assent to the proposition, it is then demanded to particular nations; and our pride and our presumption too often make converts of us. I contend that it is to arraign the disposition of Providence himself to suppose that He has created beings incapable of governing themselves, and to be trampled on by kings. Self-government is the natural government of man."

Clay was right. There are degrees of proficiency in the art of self-government, but it is a reflection upon the Creator to say that he denied to any people the capacity for self-government. Once admit that some people are capable of self-government and that others are not and that the capable people have a right to seize upon and govern the incapable, and you make force—brute force—the only foundation of govern-

ment and invite the reign of a despot. I am not willing to believe that an all-wise and an all-loving God created the Filipinos and then left them thousands of years helpless until the islands attracted the attention of European nations.

Republicans ask, "Shall we haul down the flag that floats over our dead in the Philippines?" The same question might have been asked when the American flag floated over Chapultepec and waved over the dead who fell there; but the tourist who visits the City of Mexico finds there a national cemetery owned by the United States and cared for by an American citizen. Our flag still floats over our dead, but when the treaty with Mexico was signed American authority withdrew to the Rio Grande, and I venture the opinion that during the last fifty years the people of Mexico have made more progress under the stimulus of independence and self-government than they would have made under a carpet-bag government held in place by bayonets. The United States and Mexico, friendly republics, are each stronger and happier than they would have been had the former been cursed and the latter crushed by an imperialistic policy disguised as "benevolent assimilation."

"Can we not govern colonies?" we are asked. The question is not what we can do, but what we ought to do. This nation can do whatever it desires to do, but it must accept responsibility for what it does. If the constitution stands in the way, the people can amend the constitution. I repeat, the nation can do whatever it desires to do, but it cannot avoid the natural and legitimate results of its own conduct.

The young man upon reaching his majority can do what he pleases. He can disregard the teachings of his parents; he can trample upon all that he has been taught to consider sacred; he can disobey the laws of the state, the laws of society and the laws of God. He can stamp failure upon his life and make his very existence a curse to his fellow men and he can bring his father and mother in sorrow to the grave; but he cannot annul the sentence, "The wages of sin is death."

And so with the nation. It is of age and it can do what it pleases; it can spurn the traditions of the past; it can repudiate the principles upon which the nation rests; it can employ force instead of reason; it can substitute might for right; it can conquer weaker people; it can exploit their lands, appropriate their property and kill their people; but it cannot repeal the moral law or escape the punishment decreed for the violation of human rights.

"Would we tread in the paths of tyranny,
Nor reckon the tyrant's cost?
Who taketh another's liberty
His freedom is also lost.

Would we win as the strong have ever won,
Make ready to pay the debt,
For the God who reigned over Babylon
Is the God who is reigning yet."

Some argue that American rule in the Philippine islands will result in the better education of the Filipinos. Be not deceived. If we expect to maintain a

colonial policy, we shall not find it to our advantage to educate the people. The educated Filipinos are now in revolt against us, and the most ignorant ones have made the least resistance to our domination. If we are to govern them without their consent and give them no voice in determining the taxes which they must pay, we dare not educate them, lest they learn to read the Declaration of Independence and the constitution of the United States and mock us for our inconsistency.

The principal arguments, however, advanced by those who enter upon a defense of imperialism are:

First—That we must improve the present opportunity to become a world power and enter into international politics.

Second—That our commercial interests in the Philippine islands and in the Orient make it necessary for us to hold the islands permanently.

Third—That the spread of the Christian religion will be facilitated by a colonial policy.

Fourth—That there is no honorable retreat from the position which the nation has taken.

The first argument is addressed to the nation's pride and the second to the nation's pocket-book. The third is intended for the church member and the fourth for the partisan.

It is sufficient answer to the first argument to say that for more than a century this nation has been a world power. For ten decades it has been the most potent influence in the world. Not only has it been a world power, but it has done more to affect the politics of the human race than all the other nations of the

world combined. Because our Declaration of Independence was promulgated others have been promulgated. Because the patriots of 1776 fought for liberty others have fought for it. Because our constitution was adopted other constitutions have been adopted.

The growth of the principle of self-government, planted on American soil, has been the overshadowing political fact of the nineteenth century. It has made this nation conspicuous among the nations and given it a place in history such as no other nation has ever enjoyed. Nothing has been able to check the onward march of this idea. I am not willing that this nation shall cast aside the omnipotent weapons of truth to seize again the weapons of physical warfare. I would not exchange the glory of this republic for the glory of all the empires that have risen and fallen since time began.

The permanent chairman of the last republican national convention presented the pecuniary argument in all its baldness when he said:

"We make no hypocritical pretense of being interested in the Philippines solely on account of others. While we regard the welfare of those people as a sacred trust, we regard the welfare of the American people first. We see our duty to ourselves as well as to others. We believe in trade expansion. By every legitimate means within the province of government and constitution we mean to sitmulate the expansion of our trade and open new markets."

This is the commercial argument. It is based upon the theory that war can be rightly waged for

pecuniary advantage, and that it is profitable to purchase trade by force and violence. Franklin denied both of these propositions. When Lord Howe asserted that the acts of Parliament which brought on the Revolution were necessary to prevent American trade from passing into foreign channels, Franklin replied:

"To me it seems that neither the obtaining nor retaining of any trade, howsoever valuable, is an object for which men may justly spill each other's blood; that the true and sure means of extending and securing commerce are the goodness and cheapness of commodities, and that the profits of no trade can ever be equal to the expense of compelling it and holding it by fleets and armies. I consider this war against us, therefore, as both unjust and unwise."

I place the philosophy of Franklin against the sordid doctrine of those who would put a price upon the head of an American soldier and justify a war of conquest upon the ground that it will pay. The democratic party is in favor of the expansion of trade. It would extend our trade by every legitimate and peaceful means; but it is not willing to make merchandise of human blood.

But a war of conquest is as unwise as it is unrighteous. A harbor and coaling station in the Philippines would answer every trade and military necessity and such a concession could have been secured at any time without difficulty.

It is not necessary to own people in order to trade with them. We carry on trade today with every part of the world, and our commerce has expanded more rapidly than the commerce of any European empire.

We do not own Japan or China, but we trade with their people. We have not absorbed the republics of Central and South America, but we trade with them. It has not been necessary to have any political connection with Canada or the nations of Europe in order to trade with them. Trade cannot be permanently profitable unless it is voluntary.

When trade is secured by force, the cost of securing it and retaining it must be taken out of the profits, and the profits are never large enough to cover the expense. Such a system would never be defended but for the fact that the expense is borne by all the people, while the profits are enjoyed by a few.

Imperialism would be profitable to the army contractors; it would be profitable to the ship owners, who would carry live soldiers to the Philippines and bring dead soldiers back; it would be profitable to those who would seize upon the franchises, and it would be profitable to the officials whose salaries would be fixed here and paid over there; but to the farmer, to the laboring man and to the vast majority of those engaged in other occupations it would bring expenditure without return and risk without reward.

Farmers and laboring men have, as a rule, small incomes and under systems which place the tax upon consumption pay much more than their fair share of the expenses of government. Thus the very people who receive least benefit from imperialism will be injured most by the military burdens which accompany it.

In addition to the evils which he and the farmer share in common, the laboring man will be the first to

suffer if oriental subjects seek work in the United States; the first to suffer if American capital leaves our shores to employ oriental labor in the Philippines to supply the trade of China and Japan; the first to suffer from the violence which the military spirit arouses and the first to suffer when the methods of imperialism are applied to our own government.

It is not strange, therefore, that the labor organizations have been quick to note the approach of these dangers and prompt to protest against both militarism and imperialism.

The pecuniary argument, though more effective with certain classes, is not likely to be used so often or presented with so much enthusiasm as the religious argument. If what has been termed the "gun-powder gospel" were urged against the Filipinos only it would be a sufficient answer to say that a majority of the Filipinos are now members of one branch of the Christian church; but the principle involved is one of much wider application and challenges serious consideration.

The religious argument varies in positiveness from a passive belief that Providence delivered the Filipinos into our hands for their good and our glory, to the exultation of the minister who said that we ought to "thrash the natives (Filipinos) until they understand who we are," and that "every bullet sent, every cannon shot and every flag waved means righteousness."

We cannot approve of this doctrine in one place unless we are willing to apply it everywhere. If there is poison in the blood of the hand it will ultimately

reach the heart. It is equally true that forcible Christianity, if planted under the American flag in the far-away Orient, will sooner or later be transplated upon American soil.

If true Christianity consists in carrying out in our daily lives the teachings of Christ, who will say that we are commanded to civilize with dynamite and proselyte with the sword? He who would declare the divine will must prove his authority either by Holy Writ or by evidence of special dispensation.

Imperialism finds no warrant in the Bible. The command "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature" has no Gatling gun attachment. When Jesus visited a village of Samaria and the people refused to receive him, some of the disciples suggested that fire should be called down from Heaven to avenge the insult; but the Master rebuked them and said: "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of; for the Son of Man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them." Suppose he had said "We will thrash them until they understand who we are," how different would have been the history of Christianity! Compare, if you will, the swaggering, bullying, brutal doctrine of imperialism with the golden rule and the commandment "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

Love, not force, was the weapon of the Nazarene; sacrifice for others, not the exploitation of them, was His method of reaching the human heart. A missionary recently told me that the stars and stripes once saved his life because his assailant recognized our flag as a flag that had no blood upon it.

Let is be known that our missionaries are seeking souls instead of sovereignty; let it be known that instead of being the advance guard of conquering armies, they are going forth to help and uplift, having their loins girt about with truth and their feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace, wearing the breastplate of righteousness and carrying the sword of the spirit; let it be known that they are citizens of a nation which respects the rights of the citizens of other nations as carefully as it protects the rights of its own citizens, and the welcome given to our missionaries will be more cordial than the welcome extended to the missionaries of any other nation.

The argument made by some that it was unfortunate for the nation that it had anything to do with the Philippine islands, but that the naval victory at Manila made the permanent acquisition of those islands necessary, is also unsound. We won a naval victory at Santiago, but that did not compel us to hold Cuba.

The shedding of American blood in the Philippine islands does not make it imperative that we should retain possession forever; American blood was shed at San Juan Hill and El Caney, and yet the president has promised the Cubans independence. The fact that the American flag floats over Manila does not compel us to exercise perpetual sovereignty over the islands; the American flag waves over Havana today, but the president has promised to haul it down when the flag of the Cuban republic is ready to rise in its place. Better a thousand times that our flag in the Orient give way to a flag representing the idea of self-govern-

ment than that flag of this republic should become the flag of an empire.

There is an easy, honest, honorable solution of the Philippine question. It is set forth in the democratic platform and it is submitted with confidence to the American people. This plan I unreservedly indorse. If elected, I will convene congress in extraordinary session as soon as inaugurated and recommned an immediate declaration of the nation's purpose, first, to establish a stable form of government in the Philippine islands, just as we are now establishing a stable form of government in Cuba; second, to give independence to the Cubans; third, to protect the Filipinos from outside interference while they work out their destiny, just as we have protected the republics of Central and South America, and are, by the Monroe doctrine, pledged to protect Cuba.

A European protectorate often results in the plundering of the ward by the guardian. An American protectorate gives to the nation protected the advantage of our strength, without making it the victim of our greed. For three-quarters of a century the Monroe doctrine has been a shield to neighboring republics and yet it has imposed no pecuniary burden upon us. After the Filipinos had aided us in the war against Spain, we could not honorably turn them over to their former masters; we could not leave them to be the victims of the ambitious designs of European nations, and since we do not desire to make them a part of us or to hold them as subjects, we propose the only alternative, namely, to give them independence and guard them against molestation from without.

When our opponents are unable to defend their position by argument they fall back upon the assertion that it is destiny, and insist that we must submit to it, no matter how much it violates our moral precepts and our principles of government. This is a complacent philosophy. It obliterates the distinction between right and wrong and makes individuals and nations the helpless victims of circumstance.

Destiny is the subterfuge of the invertebrate, who, lacking the courage to oppose error, seeks some plausible excuse for supporting it. Washington said that the destiny of the republican form of government was deeply, if not finally, staked on the experiment entrusted to the American people. How different Washington's definition of destiny from the republican definition!

The Republicans say that this nation is in the hands of destiny; Washington believed that not only the destiny of our own nation but the destiny of the republican form of government throughout the world was intrusted to American hands. Immeasurable responsibility! The destiny of this Republic is in the hands of its own people, and upon the success of the experiment here rests the hope of humanity. No exterior force can disturb this Republic, and no foreign influence should be permitted to change its course. What the future has in store for this nation no one has authority to declare, but each individual has his own idea of the nation's mission, and he owes it to his country as well as to himself to contribute as best he may to the fulfillment of that mission.

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the Committee: I can never fully discharge the debt of gratitude which I owe to my countrymen for the honors which they have so generously bestowed upon me; but, sirs, whether it be my lot to occupy the high office for which the convention has named me, or to spend the remainder of my days in private life, it shall be my constant ambition and my controlling purpose to aid in realizing the high ideals of those whose wisdom and courage and sacrifices brought this Republic into existence.

I can conceive of a national destiny surpassing the glories of the present and the past—a destiny which meets the responsibility of today and measures up to the possibilities of the future. Behold a republic, resting securely upon the foundation stones quarried by revolutionary patriots from the mountain of eternal truth—a republic applying in practice and proclaiming to the world the self-evident propositions that all men are created equal; that they are endowed with inalienable rights; that governments are instituted among men to secure these rights, and that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. Behold a republic in which civil and religion liberty stimulate all to earnest endeavor and in which the law restrains every hand uplifted for a neighbor's injury—a republic in which every citizen is a sovereign, but in which no one cares to wear a crown. Behold a republic standing erect while empires all around are bowed beneath the weight of their own armaments—

a republic whose flag is loved while other flags are only feared. Behold a republic increasing in population, in wealth, in strength and in influence, solving the problems of civilization and hastening the coming of an universal brotherhood—a republic which shakes thrones and dissolves aristocracies by its silent example and gives light and inspiration to those who sit in darkness. Behold a republic gradually but surely becoming the supreme moral factor in the world's progress and the accepted arbiter of the world's disputes—a republic whose history, like the path of the just, "is as the shining light that shineth more and more unto the perfect day."

"I Have Kept the Faith"

At the Democratic National Convention, St. Louis, Mr. Bryan in Seconding the Nomination of Senator F. M. Cockrell, Spoke as Follows.

ST. LOUIS CONVENTION SPEECH.

At the democratic national convention at St. Louis Mr. Bryan, in seconding the nomination of Senator F. M. Cockrell, spoke as follows:

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the Convention: Two nights without sleep and a cold make it difficult for me to make myself heard. I trust that my voice will improve in a moment, but as I desire to speak to the delegates rather than to the galleries, I hope that they at least will be able to hear.

Eight years ago a democratic national convention placed in my hand the standard of the party and commissioned me as its candidate. Four years later that commission was renewed. I come tonight to this democratic national convention to return the commission. You may dispute whether I have fought a good fight, you may dispute whether I have finished my course, but you cannot deny that I have kept the faith.

As your candidate I did all that I could to bring success to the party; as a private citizen I feel more interested in a democratic success today than I ever did when I was a candidate.

The reasons that made the election of a democrat desirable were stronger in 1900 than in 1896, and the reasons that make the election of a democrat desirable are stronger now than they were in 1900.

The gentleman who presented New York's candidate dwelt upon the dangers of militarism, and he did not overstate those dangers. Let me quote the most remarkable passage ever found in a speech nominating a candidate for the presidency.

Governor Black, of New York, in presenting the name of Theodore Roosevelt to the republican convention of this year used these words:

"The fate of nations is still decided by their wars. You may talk of orderly tribunals and learned referees; you may sing in your schools the gentle praises of the quiet life; you make strike from your books the last note of every martial anthem, and yet out in the smoke and thunder will always be the tramp of horses and the silent, rigid, upturned face. Men may prophesy and women pray, but peace will come here to abide forever on this earth only when the dreams of childhood are the accepted charts to guide the destinies of men.

"Events are numberless and mighty, and no man can tell which wire runs around the world. The nation basking today in the quiet of contentment and repose may still be on the deadly circuit and tomorrow writhing in the toils of war. This is the time when great figures must be kept in front. If the pressure is great the material to resist it must be granite and iron."

This is a eulogy of war. This is a declaration that the hoped for, prayed for, era of perpetual peace will never come. This is an exalting of the doctrine of brute force; it darkens the hopes of the race.

This republican president, a candidate for re-election, is presented as the embodiment of the warlike spirit as "the granite and iron" that represents modern militarism.

Do you, men of the east, desire to defeat the military idea? Friends of the south, are you anxious to defeat the military idea? Let me assure you that not one of you north, east, or south, fears more than I do the triumph of that idea. If this is the doctrine that our nation is to stand for, it is retrogression, not progress. It is a lowering of the ideals of the nation. It is a turning backward to the age of violence. More than that, it is nothing less than a challenge to the Christian civilization of the world.

Some twenty-six hundred years ago a prophet foretold the coming of One who was to be called the Prince of Peace. Nearly two thousand years ago He came upon the earth, and the song that was sung at His birth was "Peace on earth, good will toward men." For almost twenty centuries this doctrine of peace has been growing; it has been taking hold upon the hearts of men. For this doctrine of peace, millions have gladly given their lives; for this doctrine of peace, thousands have crossed oceans and labored in distant lands, aye, even among savage tribes. This doctrine of peace, the foundation of Christian civilization, has been the growing hope and inspiration of the world. And now, an ex-governor of the largest state in the Union presents for the office of president of the greatest republic of all history, a man who is described as "granite and iron," as one who represents, not the doctrine of peace and arbitration, but the doctrine that the

destinies of nations must still be settled by their wars.

Will you democrats of New York present a graver indictment against President Roosevelt than that? Can you of the south present a more serious accusation? I do not ask concerning the character of the president. He may have every virtue; his life may be exemplary in every way; but if he shares the views of the man who placed him in nomination, if he believes with his sponsor that wars must settle the destinies of nations; that peace is but an idle, childish dream; that women may pray for it; that men may prophesy about it; but that all this talk of "orderly tribunals and learned referees" is but an empty sound —if he believes these things he is a dangerous man for our country and for the world. I believe he ought to be defeated; I believe he can be defeated; and if the democratic party does what it ought to do, I believe he will be defeated.

How can he be defeated? As your candidate I tried to defeat the republican party. I failed, you say. Yes, I failed. I received a million more votes than any democrat had ever received before, and yet I failed. Why did I fail? Because some who had affiliated with the democratic party thought my election would be injurious to the country, and they left the party and helped to elect my opponent. That is why I failed. I have no words of criticism for them. I have always believed, I believe tonight, I shall ever believe, I hope, that a man's duty to his country is higher than his duty to his party. I hope that men of all parties will have the moral courage to leave their parties when they believe that to stay with their parties would injure their

country. The success of our government depends upon the independence and the moral courage of its citizens.

But, my friends, if I, with six million and a half votes, failed to defeat the republican party, can those who defeated me succeed in defeating the republican party? If under the leadership of those who were loyal in 1896 we failed, shall we succeed under the leadership of those who were not loyal in 1896?

If we are going to have some other god besides this modern Mars, presented to us by Governor Black, what kind of a god is it to be? Must we choose between a god of war and a god of gold.

If there is anything that compares in hatefulness with militarism, it is plutocracy, and I insist that the democratic party ought not to be compelled to choose between militarism on the one side and plutocracy on the other.

We have agreed upon a platform, after a session of sixteen hours. We entered the committee room at 8 last evening and left it at 12 today. But I never employed sixteen hours to better advantage in my life. I helped to bring the party together. The report was unanimous and we can go before the country with a united party.

How did we reach an agreement? The platform is not all that we of the west desired; it is not all that our eastern democrats desired. We had to consent to the omission of some things that we wanted in the platform. They had to consent to the omission of some things that they wanted in the platorm. But by

mutual concession we agreed upon a platform, and we will stand on that platform in this campaign.

But, my friends, we need more than a platform We must nominate a ticket, and that is the work now before this convention. Had a majority of you come to this convention instructed for any man I not only would not ask you to disregard your instructions; I would not, if I could prevent it, permit you to disregard your instructions.

I believe in the right of the people to rule. I believe in the right of the people to instruct their delegates, and when a delegate is instructed, the instruction is binding upon him. But no candidate comes with a majority instructed for him. That means that you, the delegates, are left to select a candidate upon your own responsibility—and a grave responsibility it is. Grave, indeed, is the responsibility resting upon the delegates assembled in this convention!

I have not come to ask anything of this convention. Nebraska asks nothing but to be permitted to fight the battles of democracy; that is all. Some of you call me a dictator. It is false. You know it is false. How have I tried to dictate? I have said that I thought certain things ought to be done. Have you not exercised the same privilege? Why have I not a right to suggest? Because I was your candidate, have I forfeited forever the right to make suggestions? Sirs, if that condition was attached to a nomination for the presidency, no man worthy to be president would ever accept a nomination. For the right of a man to have an opinion and to express it is more important and

more sacred than the holding of any office however high.

I expressed my opinion in regard to the platform; I made my suggestions. Not all of them were adopted. I should like to have seen the Kansas City platform reaffirmed. I am not ashamed of that platform. I believe in it now, as I believed in it when I was running upon it as your candidate, but the delegates do not agree with me, and their will is supreme in the making of the platform. When they veto my suggestions, I must submit; there is no other court to which I can appeal.

Neither have I attempted to dictate in regard to candidates. I have not asked the democrats of this nation to nominate any particular man. I have said and repeat that there are men in every state qualified for the presidency; I have also said and repeat that out of the six and a half millions who voted for me in both campaigns, we ought to be able to find at least one man fit to be president. I have made these suggestions, but they are only suggestions. I am here tonight as a delegate from Nebraska. I have not confidence enough in my own judgment to tell you that I can pick out a man and say, "This man must be nominated or we shall lose." I have, I think, a reasonable faith in my own opinions; at least I would rather stand by my opinion if I believe it right than to accept the opinion of any one else if I believe that opinion to be wrong.

But I am not asking for the nomination of any particular man. We have a platform upon which we all can stand. Now give us a ticket behind which all

of us can stand. Go into any state you please for a candidate. I have not as much faith as some have in the value of locality. I have never believed much in nominating candidates from doubtful states on the theory that their personal popularity would elect them.

I have so much confidence in democratic principles that I think a democrat ought to vote for a good man from any other state rather than vote for a bad man from his own state. The state pride argument is often given too much weight. I have found that when people come with a candidate and tell us, first, that we must carry a certain state, and, second, that their man is the only one who can carry that state, they do not put up a bond to deliver the votes. And then, anyhow, a state which is so uncertain that only one democrat in the nation can carry it, cannot be relied upon in a great crisis.

Select a candidate. If it is the wish of this convention that the standard shall be placed in the hand of the gentleman presented by California, a man who, though he has money, pleads the cause of the poor; the man who is best beloved, I think I can safely say, among laboring men, of all the candidates proposed; the man who more than any other represents opposition to the trusts—if you want to place the standard in his hand and make Mr. Hearst the candidate of this convention, Nebraska will be with you in the fight.

If you think that the gentleman from Wisconsin who, though faithful in both campaigns, was not with us on the money question—if you think that Mr. Wall, who agrees with the east on the gold question and with the west on other questions, would draw the

party together, place the standard in his hand, and Nebraska will be with you and contribute her part.

If you prefer an eastern man and can find some one who will give both elements of the party something to believe in, something to trust in, something to hope for, we are willing to join you in selecting him as the standard-bearer.

Not all of the available men have been mentioned. There is in the state of Pennsylvania a man whom I desire to suggest, and I do it without consulting his delegation and without the consent of the man himself. He is an eastern man, who voted with us in both campaigns, although against us on the money question, but, I believe, he is in sympathy with the people; a man twice governor of a great state; a man who only two years ago when again a candidate carried the state of Pennsylvania, outside of the two great cities of Philadelphia and Pittsburg.

If you eastern democrats who insist that your objection to me is that I believe in free silver—if you are willing to take ex-Governor Pattison, a gold man, I am willing to let you have your way on that question, for I will trust his honesty on all questions. But I only mention these candidates by way of illustration.

I desire to second the nomination of a man whose name has already been presented, and I second his nomination, not because I can assert to you that he is more available than any other person who might be named, but because I love the man and because on the platform we have adopted there is no good reason why any democrat in the east should vote against him.

I second the nomination of Senator Cockrell of Missouri.

He is the nestor of the senate; he is experienced in public affairs. He is known; he has a record, and can be measured by it. I would be willing to write my indorsement on his back and guarantee everything he did.

It is said that he comes from the south. What if he does? I do not share the feeling that some have that the democratic party cannot take a candidate from the south. It is said he was in the confederate army. What if he was? I do not share the belief of those who say that we cannot afford to nominate an ex-confederate. That war, that cruel war, occurred forty years ago. Its issues are settled; its wounds are healed, and the participants are friends. We have another war on now, and those who know what the war between the democracy and plutocracy means, will not ask where the candidate stood forty years ago; they will ask where he stands today—on which side he is fighting in the present conflict.

The great issue in this country today is "democracy versus plutocracy." I have been accused of having but one idea—silver. A few years ago it was said that I had only one, but then it was tariff reform. But there is an issue greater than the silver issue, the tariff issue or the trust issue. It is the issue between democracy and plutocracy—whether this is to be a government of the people, administered by officers chosen by the people, and administered in behalf of the people, or a government by the moneyed element of the country in the interest of predatory wealth. This issue is growing.

I ask you to help us to meet this issue. You tell me that the republican candidate stands for militarism. Yes, but he also stands for plutocracy. You tell me that he delights in war. Yes, but there is another objection to him, and that is that he does not enforce the law against a big criminal as he does against a little criminal. The laws are being violated today, and those laws must be enforced. The government must be administered according to the maxim: "Equal rights to all and special privileges to none."

We have seen our elections debauched. It was stated the other day that into the little state of Delaware, two hundred and fifty-six thousand dollars were sent at one time just before the election of 1896. Some say that our party must have a great campaign fund and bid against the republicans. Let me warn you that if the democratic party is to save this nation, it must save it, not by purchase, but by principle. That is the only way to save it. Every time we resort to purchase, we encourage the spirit of barter. Under such a system the price will constantly increase, and the elections will go to the highest bidder. If the democratic party is to save this country, it must appeal to the conscience of the country. It must point out impending dangers; and if the party will nominate a man, I care not from what part of the country he comes, who is not the candidate of a faction, who is not the candidate of an element, but the candidate of the party, the party will stand by him and will drive the republican party from power.

You could, I believe, take a man from any southern state—a man who would appeal to all democrats who love democratic principles, and to those repub-

licans who begin to fear for their nation's welfare, and he would poll a million more votes than the candidate of any faction whose selection would be regarded as a triumph of a part of the party over the rest of the party.

I simply submit these suggestions for your consideration. I am here to discharge a duty that I owe to the party. I knew before coming to this convention that a majority of the delegates would not agree with me in regard to the financial plank. I knew that there would be among the delegates many who voted against me when I sorely needed their help. I am not objecting to the majority against me, nor to the presence of those who left us in 1896 and have since returned; I am here, not because I enjoy being in the minority, but because I owe a duty to the more than six million brave and loyal men who sacrificed for the ticket in recent campaigns. I came to help to get them as good a platform as I could; I have helped to get them a good platform. I came to help to get as good a candidate as possible, and I hope that he will be one who can draw the factions together—one who will give to us who believe in positive, aggressive, democratic reform, something to hope for, something to fight for—one who will also give to those who have differed from us on the money question something to hope for, something to fight for. And I close with an appeal from my heart to the hearts of those who hear me: Give us a pilot who will guide the democratic ship away from the Scylla of militarism without wrecking her upon the Charybdis of commercialism.

Naboths Vineyard

Extract from a Speech Delivered by Mr. Bryan in Denver, January 17, 1899, at the Joint Invitation of the Chairman of the Democratic, Populist and Silver Republican State Committees.

NABOTH'S VINEYARD.

"The Bible tells us that Ahab, the king, wanted the vineyard of Naboth and was sorely grieved because the owner thereof refused to part with the inheritance of his fathers. Then followed a plot, and false charges were preferred against Naboth to furnish an excuse for getting rid of him.

"'Thou shalt not covet!' 'Thou shalt not bear false witness!' 'Thou shalt not kill'—three commandments broken, and still a fourth, 'Thou shalt not steal,' to be broken in order to get a little piece of ground! And what was the result? When the king went forth to take possession, Elijah, that brave old prophet of the early days, met him and pronounced against him the sentence o the Almighty. 'In the place where the dogs licked the blood of Naboth shall the dogs lick thy blood, even thine.'

"Neither his own exalted position nor the lowly station of his victim could save him from the avenging hand of outraged justice His case was tried in a court where neither wealth, nor rank, nor power can shield the transgressor

"Wars of conquest have their origin in covetousness, and the history of the human race has been written in characters of blood because rulers have looked with longing eyes upon the lands of others.

"Covetousness is prone to seek the aid of false pretense to carry out its plans, but what it cannot secure by persuasion it takes by the sword.

"Senator Teler's amendment to the intervention resolution saved the Cubans from the covetousness of those who are so anxious to secure possession of the island, that they are willing to deny the truth of the declaration of our own congress, that 'the people of Cuba are, and of right ought to be free.'

"Imperialism might expand the nation's territory, but it would contract the nation's purpose. It is not a step forward toward a broader destiny; it is a step backward, toward the narrow views of kings and emperors.

"Dr. Taylor has aptly expressed it in his 'Creed of the Flag,' when he asks:

'Shall we turn to the old world again
With the penitent prodigal's cry?'

"I answer, never. This republic is not a prodigal son; it has not spent its substance in riotous living. It is not ready to retrace its steps and, with shamed face and trembling voice, solicit an humble place among the servants of royalty. It has not sinned against Heaven, and God grant that the crowned heads of Europe may never have occasion to kill the fatted calf to commemorate its return from reliance upon the will of the people to dependence upon the authority which flows from regal birth or superior force!

"We cannot afford to enter upon a colonial policy. The theory upon which a government is built is a matter of vital importance. The national idea has a con-

trolling influence upon the thought and character of the people. Our national idea is self-government, and unless we are ready to abandon that idea forever we cannot ignore it in dealing with the Filipinos.

"That idea is entwined with our traditions; it permeates our history; it is a part of our literature.

"That idea has given eloquence to the orator and inspiration to the poet. Take from our national hymns the three words, free, freedom and liberty, and they would be as meaningless as would be our flag if robbed of its red, white and blue.

"Other nations may dream of wars of conquest and of distant dependencies governed by external force; not so with the United States.

"The fruits of imperialism, be they bitter or sweet, must be left to the subjects of monarchy. This is the one tree of which the citizens of a republic may not partake. It is the voice of the serpent, not the voice of God, that bids us eat."

British Rule in India

Written for and copyrighted by the New York Journal, and reproduced by courtesy of that newspaper.

BRITISH RULE IN INDIA.

In the discussion of a colonial policy for the United States frequent references will be made to England's government of India. The imperialists are already declaring that Great Britain's policy has resulted in profit to herself and benefit to her Asiatic subjects.

The opponents of imperialism, on the other hand, find in India's experience a warning against a policy which places one nation under the control of another and distant nation.

In 1600 the first East India company was organized. Its charter was for fifteen years, but a new and perpetual charter was granted in 1609. Under the reign of Charles II. the company obtained another charter which continued former privileges and added authority "to make peace or war with any prince or people (in India) not being Christian."

The affairs of the company were managed with an eye single to gain, and intervention in the quarrels of native princes resulted in the gradual extension of its influence. Money was the object, and the means employed would not always bear scrutiny. There was, however, no hypocritical mingling of an imaginary "philanthropy" with an actual "five per cent."

In 1757 Lord Clive, by the battle of Plassey, made the company the dominant power in Indian politics,

and under Clive and Hastings the income of the East India Company reached enormous proportions.

The history of the century, beginning with the battle of Plassey and ending with the Sepoy mutiny in 1857, was written under headlines like the following: "The First War with Hyder Ali," "The Rohilla War," "The Second War with Hyder Ali," "The War with Tippoo Saib," "The War with the Mahrattas," "Suppression of the Pindaris," "The Last of the Peshwas," "The First Burmese War," "The First Afghan War," "The Conquest of Scinde," "The Sekh Wars," "The Conquest of Punjab," "The Annexation of Pegu," "The Annexation of Oudh," "The Outbreak of Meerut," "The Seizure of Delhi." "The Siege of Lucknow," etc.

This brief review is not given because it is interesting, but to acquaint the reader with the imperialistic plan of solving the problem of civilization by the elimination of unruly factors.

In 1858 Parliament, by an act entitled an act "for the better government of India," confessed that the management of Indian affairs could be improved and placed the control in the hands of a Secretary of State for India and a Council.

In 1877 Queen Victoria assumed the title, Empress of India.

Even if it could be shown that England's sovereignty over India had brought blessings to the Indian people and advantage to the inhabitants of Great Britain, we could not afford to adopt the policy. A monarchy can engage in work which a republic dare not undertake. A monarchy is constructed upon the

theory that authority descends from the king and that privileges are granted by the crown to the subjects. Of course the ruling power recognizes that it owes a duty to the people, but while the obligation is binding upon the conscience of the sovereign it cannot be enforced by the subject.

Webster presented this idea with great force in his speech on the Greek revolution. After setting forth the agreement between the Allied Powers, he said: "The first of these principles is, that all popular or constitutional rights are holden not otherwise than as grants from the crown. Society, upon this principle, has no rights of its own; it takes good government, when it gets it, as a boon and a concession, but can demand nothing. It is to live in that favor which emanates from royal authority and if it have the misfortune to lose that favor, there is nothing to protect it against any degree of injustice and oppression. It can rightfully make no endeavor for a change, by itself; its whole privilege is to receive the favors that may be dispensed by the sovereign power, and all its duty is described in the single word, submission. This is the plain result of the principal continental state papers; indeed, it is nearly the identical text of some of them."

The English people have from time to time forced the crown to recognize certain rights, but the principle of monarchy still exists. The sovereign has a veto upon all legislation; the fact that this veto has not been used of late does not change the governmental theory, and, in India, the application of the

theory has deprived the Indian people of participation in the control of their own affairs.

A nation which denies the principle that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed can give self-government to one colony and deny it to another; it can give it to colonies strong enough to exact it by force and deny it to weaker ones; but a nation which recognizes the people as the only sovereigns, and regards those temporarily in authority merely as public servants, is not at liberty to apply the principle to one section of the country and refuse it to another.

But, so far from supporting the contention of the imperialists, British rule in India really enforces every argument that can be made against a colonial system of government. In the first place, to authorize a commercial company "to make peace or war with any prince or people (not Christian)," according to its pleasure, was to place the pecuniary interests of a few stockholders above the rights of those with whom they had dealings. Clive and Hastings seem to have acted upon this authority. When the former was called to account he confessed that he had forged a treaty, and his conduct was such that Parliament was compelled to vote that he "had abused his powers and set an evil example to the servants of the public," but, as he had increased the power of England in India, his condemnation was accompanied by the declaration that he had, "at the same time, rendered great and meritorious services to his country."

The prosecution of Hastings for wrongs inflicted upon the people of India occupies a conspicuous place

among the political trials of history. The speeches made against him recall the orations of Cicero against Verres, who, by the way, was also charged with plundering a colony.

Cicero said that Verres relied for his hope of escape upon his ability to corrupt the judges of his day, and it appears that the East India Company was also accused of polluting the stream of justice only a century ago.

In his speech on the Nabob of Arcot's debts, Burke, said: "Let no man hereafter talk of the decaying energies of nature. All the acts and monuments in the records of peculation; the consolidated corruption of ages; the pattern of exemplary plunder in the heroic times of Roman iniquity, never equaled the gigantic corruption of this single act. Never did Nero, in all his insolent prodigality of despotism, deal out to his praetorian guards a donation fit to be named with the largess showered down by the bounty of our chancellor of the exchequer on the faithful band of Indian sepoys."

How little human nature changes from age to age! How weak is the boasted strength of the arm of the law when the defendant possesses the influence purchased by great wealth, however obtained, and the accusation comes from a far-off victim of oppression!

Those who expect justice to be exercised by officials far removed from the source of power—officials who do not receive their commissions from, and cannot be removed by, the people whom they govern—should read Sheridan's great speech portraying the effect of the Hastings policy upon the people of India.

Below will be found an extract:

"If, my lords, a stranger had at this time entered the province of Oude, ignorant of what had happened since the death of Sujah Dowlah, that prince who, with a savage heart, had still great lines of character, and who, with all his ferocity in war, had with a cultivating hand preserved to his country the wealth which it derived from benignant skies, and a prolific soil; if observing the wide and general devastation of fields unclothed and brown; of vegetation burnt up and extinguished; of villages depopulated and in ruin; of temples unroofed and perishing; of reservoirs broken down and dry, this stranger would ask, 'What has thus laid waste this beautiful and opulent land; what monstrous madness has ravaged with widespread war; what desolating foreign foe; what civil discords; what disputed succession; what religious zeal; what fabled monster has stalked abroad, and, with malice and mortal enmity to man, withered by the grasp of death every growth of nature and humanity, all means of delight, and each original, simple principle of bare existence?' The answer would have been: Not one of these causes! No wars have ravaged these lands and depopulated these villages! No desolating foreign foe, no domestic broils, no disputed succession, no religious superserviceable zeal, no poisonous monster, no affliction of Providence, which, while it scourges us, cut off the sources of resuscitation!

"No. This damp of death is the mere effusion of British amity! We sink under the pressure of their support! We writhe under their perfidious gripe!

They have embraced us with their protecting arms, and lo! these are the fruits of their alliance!"

No clearer case was ever made against a prisoner at the bar, and yet after a seven years' trial before the House of Lords Hastings was acquitted, not because he was guiltless, but because England had acquired territory by his policy.

Lord Macaulay, in describing the crimes perpetrated at that time against a helpless people, gives expression to a truth which has lost none of its force with the lapse of years. He says: "And then was seen what we believe to be the most frightful of all spectacles, the strength of civilization without its mercy. To all other despotism there is a check, imperfect indeed, and liable to gross abuse, but still sufficient to preserve society from the last extreme of misery. A time comes when the evils of submission are obviously greater than those of resistance, when fear itself begets a sort of courage, when a convulsive burst of popular rage and despair warns tyrants not to presume too far on the patience of mankind. But against misgovernment such as then afflicted Bengal, it is impossible to struggle. The superior intelligence and energy of the dominant class made their power irresistible. A war of Bengalees against Englishmen was like a war of sheep against wolves, of men against demons."

"The strength of civilization without its mercy!"

The American people are capable of governing themselves, but what reason have we to believe that they can wisely administer the affairs of distant races?

It is difficult enough to curb corporate power in this country, where the people who suffer have in their own hands the means of redress; how much more difficult it would be to protect the interests of the people where the people who do the governing do not feel the suffering and where the people who do the suffering must rely upon the mercy of alien rulers!

True, Macaulay argues that English morality, tardily but finally, followed English authority into the Orient, but, as a matter of fact, the bleeding of India has continued systematically during the present century. Polite and refined methods have been substituted for the rude and harsh ones formerly employed, and the money received is distributed among a larger number, but the total sum annually drawn from India is greater now than it was when England's foremost orators and statesmen were demanding the impeachment of notorious malefactors.

Sir J. Strachey, an Englishman, in a history recently published, is quoted as saying that "the confiscation of the rights of the ryots (in Bengal) has reached vast proportions." He then shows that through the action of the English government the Zemindars, or middle men, have been able to enormously increase their income at the expense of the tillers of the soil, the increase being from four hundred thousand pounds in the last century to thirteen million pounds at the present time.

On the 28th of December, 1897—only a year ago —a meeting of the London Indian Society was held at Montague Mansions and strong resolutions adopted. Below will be found an extract from the resolutions:

"That this conference of Indians, resident in the United Kingdom, is of opinion—

"That of all the evils and 'terrible misery' that India has been suffering for a century and a half, and of which the latest developments are the most deplorable, famine and plague, arising from ever-increasing poverty, the stupid and suicidal Frontier War and its savagery, of the wholesale destruction of villages, unworthy of any people, but far more so of English civiilzation; the unwise and suicidal prosecutions for sedition; the absurd and ignorant cry of the disloyalty of the educated Indians, and for the curtailment of the liberty of the Indian press; the despotism—like that of the imprisonment of the Natus, and the general insufficiency and inefficiency of the administration—of all these and many other minor evils the main cause is the unrighteous and un-British system of government which produces an unceasing and ever-increasing bleeding of the country, and which is maintained by a political hypocrisy and continuous subterfuges unworthy of the British honor and name, and entirely in opposition to the wishes of the British people, and utterly in violation of acts and resolutions of Parliament, and of the most solemn and repeated pledges of the British nation and sovereign.

"That unless the present unrighteous and un-British system of government is thoroughly reformed into a righteous and truly British system destruction to India and disaster to the British empire must be the inevitable result."

Mr. Naoroji, an Indian residing in England, in supporting the resolution, pointed out the continuous

drain of money from India and argued that the people were compelled "to make brick, not only without straw, but even without clay." He insisted that England's trade with India would be greater if she would allow the people of India a larger participation in the affairs of their own government, and protested against the policy of sending Englishmen to India to hold the offices and draw their support from taxes levied upon the inhabitants. He complained that British justice is one thing in England and quite another thing in India, and said: "There (In India) it is only the business of the people to pay taxes and to slave; and the business of the government to spend those taxes to their own benefit. Whenever any question arises between Great Britain and India there is a demoralized mind. The principles of politics, of commerce, of equality which are applied to Great Britain are not applied to India. As if it were not inhabited by human beings!"

Does any one doubt that if we annex the Philippines and govern them by agents sent from here, questions between them and the people of the United States will be settled by the people of the United States and for the benefit of the people of the United States? If we make subjects of them against their will and for our own benefit are we likely to govern them with any more benevolence?

The resolutions quoted mention efforts for the curtailment of the liberty of the press. Is that not a necessary result of governmental injustice? Are we likely to allow the Filipinos freedom of the press, if

we enter upon a system that is indefensible according to our theory of government?

Mr. Hyndman, an English writer, in a pamphlet issued in 1897, calls attention to English indifference to India's wrongs, and, as an illustration of this indifference, cites the fact that during the preceding year the India budget affecting the welfare of nearly three hundred millions of people was brought before Parliament on the last day of the session when only a few members were present. He asserts that "matters are far worse now than they were in the days of the old East India Company," and that "nothing short of a great famine, a terrible pestilence, or a revolt on a large scale, will induce the mass of Englishmen to devote any attention whatever to the affairs of India."

To show how, in the government of India, the interests of English office-holders outweigh the interests of the natives, I give an extract from the pamphlet already referred to:

"First, under the East India Company, and then, and far more completely, under the direct rule of the Crown of the English people, the natives have been shut out from all the principal positions of trust over five-sixths of Hindostan, and have been prevented from gaining any experience in the higher administration, or in military affairs.

"Wherever it was possible to put in an Englishman to oust a native an Englishman has been put in, and has been paid from four times to twenty times as much for his services as would have sufficed for the salary of an equally capable Hindo or Mohammedan official. * * * At the present time, out of 39,000

officials who draw a salary of more than 1,000 rupees a year, 28,000 are Englishmen and only 11,000 natives. Moreover, the 11,000 natives receive as salaries only three million pounds a year; the 28,000 Englishmen receive fifteen million pounds a year. Out of the 960 important civil offices which really control the civil administration of India 900 are filled with Englishmen and only sixty with natives. Still worse, if possible, the natives of India have no control whatsoever in any shape or way over their own taxation, or any voice at all in the expenditure of their own revenues. Their entire government—I speak, of course, of the 250,000,000 under our direct control—is carried on and administered by foreigners, who not only do not settle in the country, but who live lives quite remote from those of the people, and return home at about forty-five or fifty years of age with large pensions.

"As I have often said in public, India is, in fact, now governed by successive relays of English carpet-baggers, who have as little sympathy with the natives as they have any real knowledge of their habits and customs."

The Statesman's Year Book of 1897, published by Macmillan & Co., London, contains some interesting statistics in regard to India.

It seems that there are but two and a quarter millions of Christians in India—less than one per cent—after so many years of English control.

It appears, also, that in 1891 only a little more than three millions out of three hundred millions were under instruction; a little more than twelve millions were not under instruction, but able to read and write,

while two hundred and forty-six millions were neither under instruction nor able to read or write. Twenty-five millions appear under the head "not returned."

The European army in India amounts to seventy-four thousand and the native army to one hundred and forty-five thousand. In the army the European officers number five thousand and the native officers twenty-seven hundred. One-fourth of the national expenditure in India goes to the support of the army. Nearly one-third of India's annual revenue is expended in Great Britain. The salary of the governor-general is 250,000 rupees per annum.

The Year Book above mentioned is also responsible for the statement that the act of 1893, closing the Indian mints to the free coinage of silver, was enacted by the Governor-General and Council upon the same day that it was introduced. Mr. Leech, former director of the United States mint, in an article in the Forum, declared that the closing of the mints in India on that occasion was the most momentous event in the monetary history of the present century. It will be remembered that this act was made the excuse for an extra session of our Congress and for the unconditional repeal of the Sherman law.

One can obtain some idea of the evils of irresponsible alien government when he reflects that an English Governor-General and an English Council changed the financial system of nearly three hundred millions of people by an act introduced and passed in the course of a single day.

No matter what views one may hold upon the money question, he cannot defend such a system of

government without abandoning every principle revered by the founders of the republic. Senator Wolcott of Colorado, one of the president's commissioners, upon his return from Europe, made a speech in the senate in which he declared that the last Indian famine was a money famine rather than a food famine. In that speech Mr. Wolcott also asserted that the closing of the India mints reduced by five hundred millions of dollars, the value of the silver accumulated in the hands of the people. If Mr. Wolcott's statement contains the smallest fraction of truth the injury done by the East India Company during its entire existence was less than the injury done by that one act of the Governor and his Council. If the famine was, in fact, a money famine, created by an act of the Governor and his Council, then indeed is English rule as cruel and merciless in India today as was the rule of the East India Company's agents a century ago. English rule in India is not bad because it is English, but because no race has yet appeared sufficiently strong in character to resist the temptations which come with irresponsible power.

We may well turn from the contemplation of an imperial policy and its necessary vices to the words of Jefferson in his first inaugural message: "Sometimes it is said that man cannot be trusted with the government of himself. Can he, then, be trusted with the government of others? Or have we found angels in the form of kings to govern him? Let history answer this question."—New York Journal, Jan. 22, 1899.

Philo Sherman Bennett

Delivered at Mr. Bennett's Funeral, August 19, 1903

Philo Sherman Bennett.

"At another time I shall take occasion to speak of the life of Philo Sherman Bennett and to draw some lessons from his career; today I must content myself with offering a word of comfort to those who knew him as husband, brother, relative or friend—and as a friend I need a share of this comfort for myself. It is sad enough to consign to the dust the body of one we love—how infinitely more sad if we were compelled to part with the spirit that animated this tenement of clay. But the best of man does not perish. We bury the brain that planned for others as well as for its master, the tongue that spoke words of love and encouragement, the hands that were extended to those who needed help and the feet that ran where duty directed, but the spirit that dominated and controlled all rises triumphant over the grave. We lay away the implements with which he wrought, but the gentle, modest, patient, sympathetic, loyal, brave and manly man whom we knew is not dead, and cannot die. It would be unfair to count the loss of his departure without counting the gain of his existence. The gift of his life we have and of this the tomb cannot deprive us. Separation, sudden and distressing as it is, cannot take from the companion of his life the recollection of forty years of affection, tenderness and confidence nor from others the memory of helpful association with him. If the sunshine which a baby

brings into a home, even if its sojourn is brief, cannot be dimmed by its death; if a child growing to manhood or womanhood brings to the parents a development of heart and head that outweighs any grief that its demise can cause, how much more does a long life full of kindly deeds leave us indebted to the Father who both gives and takes away. The night of death makes us remember with gratitude the light of the day that has gone while we look forward to the morning.

"The impress made by the life is lasting. We think it wonderful that we can by means of the telephone or the telegraph talk to those who are many miles away, but the achievements of the heart are even more wonderful, for the heart that gives inspiration to another heart influences all the generations yet to come. What finite mind, then, can measure the influence of a life that touched so many lives as did our friend's?

"To the young, death is an appalling thing, but it ought not to be to those whose advancing years warn them of its certain approach. As we journey along life's road we must pause again and again to bid farewell to some fellow traveler. In the course of nature the father and the mother die, then brothers and sisters follow, and finally the children and the children's children cross to the unknown world beyond—one by one 'from love's shining circle the gems drop away' until the 'king of terrors' loses his power to affright us and the increasing company on the farther shore make us first willing and then anxious to join them. It is God's way. It is God's way.

Wonders of the West

Written for The Commoner

THE WONDERS OF THE WEST.

A summer trip to the Rocky Mountain region answers a three-fold purpose; it gives rest and recreation to those who are weary; it repays the tourist who is in search of the rare, the beautiful and the sublime in nature, and it furnishes an inspiration and a moral stimulus that the fertile prairies, the growing cities and even the boundless ocean can not supply.

A fourth reason for a mountain trip can be found in the altitude, if one needs the tonic furnished by the rarer air, for to those who suffer from any sort of pulmonary trouble the breezes of the mountains bear healing in their wings. During the past seven years I have spent three brief vacations in the Rockies and they have not only been invigorating but they have furnished to my family and to myself an opportunity to view the wonders of the west.

Yellowstone Park.

In 1897 we made a tour of Yellowstone park. Leaving the Union Pacific in eastern Idaho at a little station near Beaver Canon, we spent seventeen days in making the trip to and through the government reservation known as Yellowstone park. About half way between the railroad and the park we found the hospitable home of Hon. A. S. Trude, the eminent Chicago lawyer, and made a brief stop there. His commodious cottage is on the bank of Snake river

which at that point is a beautiful, transparent stream, about waist deep. The fishing is excellent there, and the same may be said of the hunting. In one day devoted to sport we secured a number of wild ducks, and about thirty sage chickens and a good string of trout. I say we, but my shooting was really not very satisfactory as Mr. Trude's father, a man past eighty and bereft of one eye, killed about two-thirds of the chickens.

We made our next stop at Dwelle's ranch, which is located near the edge of the park. Here, too, fish and game were abundant. In the park itself no hunting is allowed but fishing is permitted, and I never saw trout caught with such ease and rapidity as in the Yellowstone river, just as it leaves the lake.

Yellowstone lake is itself an object of interest, being one of the largest of the mountain lakes. A small steamboat takes the tourist a picturesque trip around its shores. It is in the edge of this lake that the famous hot spring is located. The spring is encased in a wall that seems to have been formed by a deposit of lime and is surrounded by the water of the lake. Here, the guide books tell us, one can catch a trout and without moving from the spot cook the fish in the water of this spring.

Not far from the edge of the lake there is a mud geyser, as it is commonly called. It is a funnel shaped hole and contains several feet of thin mud. Every few moments a puff of gas coming up from below spatters the mud against the sides of the hole and by the time the mud has fallen back into the pit, it is again blown out. When I visited the mud geyser the campaign of

1896 was fresh in my mind, and the working plan of the mud geyser recalled the editorial policy of some of the opposition papers, especially the New York Tribune.

The hot water geysers of the Yellowstone are to many the chief attraction. Of these Old Faithful is the most constant though not the largest. One can not visit this section of the park, look upon these intermittent pillars of boiling water and thread his way among the smoking hot pools, without feeling that in spite of the altitude he is close to the infernal regions, and this impression is strengthened by the names that have been given to various localities and objects of interest. One place is called Hell's Half Acre, and it has earned the appellation for it not only contains a number of hot pools and geysers, but it is encrusted with a sediment from the hot springs that gives forth a hollow sound and makes one feel that there is but a thin crust between him and raging fires beneath. A cave in this vicinity is called the Devil's Kitchen, while a small spring which flows at intervals is called the Devil's Inkstand. The Devil is also the recognized owner of a frying pan, some paint pots and other articles of ornament and utility. Some of the pools of hot water are strikingly beautiful, reflecting from their depths all the colors of the rainbow, the principal of these being called the Morning Glory. In some instances the springs issuing from the hillside have formed terraces covering acres of ground. These terraces are richly colored by the various mineral deposits.

The canyon of the Yellowstone is one of the principal features of the park. The deep gorge with its brilliantly colored, sloping walls, the falls with dashing spray, the stream which in the distance looks like a tiny thread of green or white according to the rapidity of the current, and the fringe of verdure at the top of the canyon—all these combine to impress the view upon one's memory.

There are hotels at the principal points of interest, so that the tourist can find lodging and food at convenient hours. The animals in the park, protected from danger, have become very tame, so that it is not unusual to see both deer and bear. From a window of one of the hotels we saw a large black bear and two cubs eating the scraps from the table. They were frightened away by some horses and after waiting awhile for the danger to pass, the old bear arose upon her hind feet to take a survey of the field. The cubs followed her example and the three presented a picture that made me wish for a kodak. While we entered the park from the west in a private conveyance, the most convenient entrance is from the north. The Northern Pacific has a branch from Livingston to Cinnabar, from which point coaches make a tour of the park at rates fixed by the government.

Yosemite.

In 1899 we made our summer vacation include a trip to Yosemite valley. While it is difficult to compare two things as dissimilar as Yellowstone park and Yosemite, it may be said of them that the former con-

tainsmoreplaces of interest while the latter is built upon a more stupendous scale.

The Yosemite is in central California and is reached by the Santa Fe and the Southern Pacific. Leaving the main lines of these roads at Merced, the traveler takes a branch road to Raymond and from that point reaches the valley by stage. The ride is an interesting one, and one is constantly wondering at the magnitude of the trees. Enormous sugar pines, some of them eight or ten feet in diameter, line the way and prepare one for the giant red woods of the Mariposa group, which are but a short distance from the Yosemite road. These are the big trees of California, but they are so symmetrical that one can hardly believe his eyes or credit the measurements which he himself takes. The largest of these trees is more than thirty feet in diameter—nearly one hundred feet in circumference. Some idea of the size of the trees can be formed when one knows that a roadway has been cut through the base of one of the trees and that when a four horse, three-seated, coach is driven through, the coach and the wheel horses are concealed within the tree.

The road to the valley leads through a mining camp which bears the euphonious title of Grub Gulch. When we arrived here we found a rope stretched across the road and the citizens drawn up in line. They bore a banner which certified to the fact that I had carried the precinct by a large majority three years before and they insisted that they were entitled to a speech from the candidate, as a return for their partiality. At Wawona, the half-way house, we

stopped for the night. The hotel nestles in a little valley by the side of a fertile meadow and the pine-clad hills which hem it in make the spot so picturesque that we were sorry to resume our journey. About noon on the second day we reached the point where the trail leading to the rim of the canyon leaves the wagon road. While the stage carried our baggage to the valley, we mounted the mules and horses and followed the path to Glacier Point, where the night was spent. From this point the view of the valley is enchanting. Looking down the walls of the canyon to the bottom of the valley, more than three thousand feet below, one sees a picture so beautiful that it hardly seems real. Five streams pour their waters, or rather their spray, into the valley, for the distance is so great that the water does not fall en masse. The Bridal Veil Falls greet one as he enters the valley and the name is not inappropriate, for the wind swaying the falling spray gives it the appearance of a fluttering veil. The falls of the Yosemite, the stream which has impressed its name upon the valley, were a disappointment, the water at that time being exceedingly low. These falls are at their best during the early summer months, when the snow is melting.

The most striking feature of the valley is the famous promontory known as El Capitan. It is a massive piece of granite a little more than half a mile high and considerably more than half a mile in width, without a crack or seam. It is the most stupendous piece of masonry that I have seen, and one stands before it in awe and reverence.

Visitors to the Yosemite are sometimes entertained by the explosion of dynamite cartridges within

the walls of the canyon, the echo from the various parts reminding one of reverberating thunder. Glacier Point is the best place for the production of this effect. The beauty of the valley is much enhanced by the verdure, everything excepting the bare rocks responding to the moisture and the warmth.

In returning from Yosemite we stopped a day at Lake Tahoe, which lies up in the mountains on the borderline between Nevada and California, fifteen miles by rail from Truckee, a station on the Southern Pacific between Ogden and San Francisco. The lake is called the Pearl of the Sierras and has a depth of two thousand feet and an area of two hundred and fifty square miles. Its elevation above the sea is something over six thousand feet and, owing to the varying depths, the water takes on many shades of blue and green.

In the northern portion of the Rockies there are innumerable fishing and hunting resorts, such as the Jackson Hole country, just south of the Yellowstone, the Big Horn Basin near Sheridan, Wyoming, the North Platte headwaters in the neighborhood of Saratoga, just south of Rawlins, Wyoming, the Black Hill streams near Custer and Spearfish, not to speak of the Gunnison country and many other places in Colorado.

The Petrified Forest.

This year we took most of our summer vacation in New Mexico and Arizona, the principal places visited being the Petrified Forest and the Grand Canyon.

The Petrified Forests are in eastern Arizona and

near the line of the Santa Fe. The two smaller forests are near Adamana; the largest of the three is near Holbrook. We visited the Holbrook forest, sixteen miles southeast of that town, and found it a place of surpassing interest. No one who has formed an opinion of the petrified wood from the few pieces seen at the various expositions can realize the immensity of the force, the size of the logs or the variety of coloring. In some places it looks like a logging camp and many of the trees seem to have been sawed into sections, the lengths proportioned somewhat to the diameter of the log. Thousands of pieces can be found showing the entire circumference of the tree, and varying in diameter from eight inches to two feet and in length from a foot to three feet—pieces convenient for shipping. Every institution of learning in the land ought to supply itself with one of these specimens for the benefit of the students. If the government, which has made a reservation of the forest, does not now permit such use of the specimens, it ought to do so, for these fragments of logs record a wondrous story of the earth's convulsions before man was born. Geologists tell us that this portion of the earth's surface was once submerged, probably by water from the Gulf of California, and that after the work of petrifaction was completed another convulsion converted this section into the arid plateau which we find there today. It is evident that these trees were at one time covered with a deposit of soil which is now being gradually washed away exposing the logs to view. As the washing continues new trees are disentombed and new acres added to the thousand or more now included in the largest forest.

One of the petrified trees is nearly nine feet in diameter and some show a length of two or three hundred feet. One tree, or what seems to be one tree, must have been more than four hundred feet high, but as the center of the tree is still covered by a deposit of soil the identity of the two sections is not clearly established. A section of one tree shows five branches and there is a stump which shows where the roots have been broken off. In what appears to have been a hollow in a stump there is something which looks like driftwood, petrified with the tree.

At the Chicago exposition in 1893 a visitor, after inspecting some of the specimens of petrified wood, innocently asked whether they were petrified by hand. The question brought a smile to the face of the man in charge of the exhibit and I smiled, too, when he related the incident to me, but I recently heard Captain Jack Crawford, the poet scout, recite some verses which make the inquiry seem less ludicrous. Captain Crawford, after a visit to the cities of the east, wrote a poem contrasting the rugged natural beauty of the western mountains with the handiwork of man and concluded each verse with the following:

"Like it? No. I love to wander
'Mid the vales an' mountains green,
In the borderland out yonder,
Where the hand o' God is seen."

I have thought often during the last few weeks of his description of the mountain country. "Where the hand o' God is seen—!" In the canyon of the Yellowstone, in the valley of the Yosemite, in the brilliantly

colored logs of the Petrified Forest and more distinctly still in the Grand Canyon of the Colorado in northern Arizona "the hand o' God is seen."

Of all the wonders of the west, the Grand Canyon, the mightiest and most impressive, is now the most accessible of them all to tourists. The Santa Fe railroad has a branch which runs from Williams to the very edge of the canyon. Here the Bright Angel hotel and others of less capacity supply the wants of the traveler and furnish outfits for a visit to the various points of interest. The Santa Fe is building at this place a hotel of one hundred rooms with all modern conveniences, which is to be run by the Harveys who have made the Harvey eating houses famous in the southwest. As the canyon is far enough south to be visited during all the months of the year it is destined to become a popular resort. The Bright Angel hotel takes its name from the beautiful stream which enters the canyou from the opposite side of the Colorado.

How can one describe this awful chasm? More than eight miles wide at the top, nearly three hundred miles long and almost a mile deep—its immensity, its beauty and its grandeur are inexpressible. The adjectives which one is accustomed to employ at the sight of other wonders seem feeble and insufficient. There are various points from which different views of the canyon can be obtained, the most extensive being Grand View, some sixteen miles distant, but the views from O'Neill's Point, only a few miles east of the Bright Angel hotel, and Rowe's Point, a like distance west of the hotel, answer every purpose. From the rim of the canyon at any of these points one looks

upon a changing scene so modified by sun and cloud and shadow that it presents a different picture each time it is seen. The canyon is made up of a great many smaller canyons and of countless piles and peaks and pinnacles of rock. Some of the rocks look like frowning forts, some like castles and others like slender spires. The different strata of rock from the granite at the base, the limestone above it, the red sandstone surmounting this, the light sandstone still higher and the softer stone at the top—these rent by earthquake, raised by volcanic action and worn by erosion, assume an infinite number of shapes, of figures and of hues.

There is an excellent trail leading from the rim of the canyon to the muddy waters of the raging Colorado. During two-thirds of the descent, one is near the walls of the canyon and can measure the depth of each stratum of rock and note the seams where the strata meet. About thirteen hundred feet above the river a spring of pure, cold water breaks forth and the vegetation about it has given the place the name of the Indian gardens. The trail from this point leads over a sloping plateau to the edge of the walls of the river where a descent of some six hundred feet is made by a picturesque route down the precipitous sides of a granite cliff.

There are "sermons in stones" and the stones of this canyon preach many impressive ones. They not only testify to the omnipotence of the Creator but they record the story of a stream which both moulds, and is moulded by, its environment. It can not escape from the walls of its prison and yet it has made its impress upon the granite as, in obedience to the law of gravi-

tation, it has gone dashing and foaming on its path to the sea.

How like a human life! Man, flung into existence without his volition, bearing the race-mark of his parents, carrying the impress of their lives to the day of his death, hedged about by an environment that shapes and moulds him before he is old enough to plan or choose, how these constrain and hem him in! And yet, he too, leaves his mark upon all that he touches as he travels, in obedience to his sense of duty, the path that leads from the cradle to the grave. But here the likeness ends. The Colorado, pure and clear in the mountains, becomes a dark and muddy flood before it reaches the ocean, so contaminated is it by the soil through which it passes; but man, if controlled by a noble purpose and inspired by high ideals, may purify, rather than be polluted by, his surroundings, and by resistance to temptation make the latter end of his life more beautiful even than the beginning.

The river also teaches a sublime lesson of patience. It has taken ages for it to do its work and in that work every drop of water has played its part. It takes time for individuals or groups of individuals to accomplish a great work and because time is required those who labor in behalf of their fellows sometimes become discouraged. Nature teaches us to labor and to wait. Viewed from day to day the progress of the race is imperceptible; viewed from year to year, it can scarcely be noted, but viewed by decades or centuries the upward trend is apparent, and every good work and word and thought contributes toward the final result. As nothing is lost in the economy of nature,

so nothing is lost in the social and moral world. As the stream is composed of an innumerable number of rivulets, each making its little offering and each necessary to make up the whole, so the innumerable number of men and women who recognize their duty to society and their obligations to their fellows are contributing according to their strength to the sum total of the forces that make for righteousness and progress.

74 90 39RSUI 30 015 6R 6899